

# The Review of English Studies

VOL. XXIV, No. 95

JULY 1948

## CHAUCER IN TARTARY

By GARDINER STILLWELL

FOR a just and accurate appreciation of Chaucer's true qualities it is unfortunate that Spenser, Warton, and above all Milton have been our chief guides in the reading of the Squire's Tale. Partly, at least, as a result of their influence the tale is for many commentators 'a typical romance'. For some it has been (as it was for Milton) a whetstone upon which an exquisitely keen style might be further sharpened. Almost all would have us believe that he who introduced humour and realism into the romantic material of the Knight's Tale; who found in the *Troilus* a splendid chance to study human nature; who created the witty Pandarus and whose observation of the world enabled him to transfigure what he found in Boccaccio; who in 'Thopas' ridiculed bad romances, and who elsewhere betrays the fact that he cannot take conventional romance entirely seriously<sup>1</sup>—that this man, in the Squire's Tale, spreads his poetic pinions, and, like the eagle of the *House of Fame* now grown grave and naïve and out of character, carries us off on a romantic joy-ride to a Tartary of golden atmosphere and magic trappings.

Milton's reading of the Squire's Tale is to my mind a curious one, indicating that he perused the tale with a romantic preconception of its solemnity, rather than closely and realistically. Why, indeed, did he mention it in *Il Penseroso* instead of in *L'Allegro*? In *L'Allegro* he exhibits great interest (literary in its associations) in the high life of chivalric persons (117-30). Yet Canacee's bright eyes, and Cambyuskan and his barons, are reserved for *Il Penseroso* (109-15), where the Squire's Tale is associated with the more elevated and tragic strains in poetry, sung 'In sage and solemn tunes' (117).

Spenser, who in the fourth book of the *Faerie Queene* wrote a delightfully Spenserian continuation of the Canacee-Cambalo theme, considered

<sup>1</sup> N.P.T., B<sup>2</sup> 4400-3. All Chaucer quotations are from *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, Mass., 1933).

that although the 'dreddest daungerous' battles of 'Cambell' and 'Triamond' (linked by him with 'Cambine' and Canacee respectively) were not to be found in Chaucer's works, nevertheless

... that renowned Poet them compyled,  
With warlike numbers and Heroicke sound. . . .<sup>1</sup>

He will now continue the tale, asking Chaucer's pardon, but feeling that the sweet infusion of the poet's own spirit, which survives in him, will enable him to meet with the original meaning or intention of the tale.<sup>2</sup> It may be questioned whether much of Chaucer's spirit survived in Spenser, for the later poet's continuation is, naturally enough, quite un-Chaucerian in manner. At the same time it must be admitted that the theme suggested by Chaucer is grist for Spenser's very romantic mill—better grist for that mill than for Chaucer's, I should say.

Warton's notion of the Squire's Tale is indicated in a statement which, significantly (as showing us both the continuity of Warton's influence and his influence on Chaucer scholarship), is quoted by Skeat:

I have already spoken at large of the Knight's Tale, one of our author's noblest compositions. That of the Canterbury Tales which deserves the next place, as written in the higher strain of poetry, and the poem by which Milton describes and characterises Chaucer, is the Squire's Tale.<sup>3</sup>

It will be observed that Warton is influenced by Milton. The sort of influence which Warton has exerted in his turn is illustrated by Joseph Sterling's 'Advertisement' for his continuation of the tale:

The ingenious Mr. Warton, in the first volume and fifteenth section of his History of English Poetry, speaks of the story of CAMBUSCAN in terms of the highest respect. He says, that after the KNIGHT'S TALE, it is the noblest of the productions of Chaucer: He proves that it is an Arabian fiction, engrafted on Gothic chivalry. This Poem was continued by Spenser, and admired by Milton. It has been considerably improved by M<sup>r</sup>. BOYSE, the Modernizer. The Concluder feels his poetic powers far inferior to those of CHAUCER and SPENSER; but as he endeavours to amuse, hopes for the indulgence of the Public.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, we see in Sterling the triple influence—Spenser, Milton, and Warton—in epitome.

Yet the tale in question, 'after the Knight's Tale . . . the noblest of the productions of Chaucer', is incomplete, and critics have sought to divine

<sup>1</sup> Canto II, Stanza 32 (*The Works of Edmund Spenser*, ed. E. Greenlaw, C. G. Osgood, F. M. Padelford; *Faerie Queene*, Book Four; special editor—Ray Heffner; Baltimore, 1935).

<sup>2</sup> Stanza 34.

<sup>3</sup> *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), iii. 464.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion* (Cambridge, 1925), i. 479, from *Cambuscan, or the Squire's Tale of Chaucer*, modernized by Mr. Boyse; continued from *Spencer's Fairy Queen*, by Mr. Ogle; and concluded by Mr. Sterling, Dublin, 1785.

the reason for its unfinished state. R. K. Root suggests that Chaucer did not know how to finish the story, and that, as Chaucer may have seen, its unfinished state is all to the good, for, like 'Kubla Khan', it has the beauty of the incomplete.<sup>1</sup> It is Grace E. Hadow's opinion that the exuberant piling up of the plot material in the fragment is well suited to the naïve Squire, but that his tale would have taken too long, and that Chaucer no doubt cut it off on purpose.<sup>2</sup> I should say, however, that Dr. Furnivall is closer to the mark:

The completion of the *Squire's Tale* would have taxed Chaucer's utmost power, even when he was at his best. The subject is one into which he could have imported little humanity. The Continuation would have been a constant strain on his invention and fancy. The work wouldn't have repaid the effort, and so the Poet turned it up, as he did the *Good Women* when he'd done nine of them out of the proposed nineteen. Who of us, in his own line, has not done the like? Man is mortal; and when a fellow man doesn't see his way thro' a bit of work, it bores him, and he drops it.<sup>3</sup>

And yet, is there not much more to be said? I suggest that we can, in the fragment as it stands, see Chaucer importing humanity into his story, somewhat to its detriment as a typical romance. The poet's treatment of the subject-matter indicates that he is not altogether at home in Tartary. So intellectual and realistic and humorous is he by temperament that his patience cannot last out the long recital of marvellous deeds, the long succession of improbable events caused chiefly by the presence of various enchanted gadgets.

The beginning of Part Two of the tale finds the comic spirit hovering over Cambyuskan's revels:

The norice of digestioun, the sleep,  
 Gan on hem wynke and bad hem taken keep  
 That muchel drynke and labour wolde han reste;  
 And with a galpyng mouth hem alle he keste,  
 And seyde that it was tyme to lye adoun,  
 For blood was in his domynacioun.  
 'Cherisseth blood, natures freend,' quod he.  
 They thanken hym galpyng, by two, by thre,  
 And every wight gan drawe hym to his reste,  
 As sleep hem bad; they tooke it for the beste. (F 347-56.)

Here the poet is sly. Though the drinking bout had, like all good things, to come to an end, the revellers made the best of it, and, taking physiological factors prudently into consideration ('Cherisseth blood'), they marched off

<sup>1</sup> *The Poetry of Chaucer*, revised edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1922), pp. 268, 269.

<sup>2</sup> *Chaucer and His Times* (London, 1941), pp. 79-82.

<sup>3</sup> 'Forewords', *John Lane's Continuation of Chaucer's 'Squire's Tale'*, Ch. Soc., ser. 2, no. 23, p. xii.

to bed, their gaping mouths repeating the image of that gaping mouth by which they had all been kissed. Chaucer refuses to tell their dreams, for their poor brains are naturally in a state of confusion. Their heads are full of the fumosity caused by the drinking of wine,

... fumositee,

That causeth dreem of which ther nys no charge.<sup>1</sup> (358-9.)

A victim of such fumosity must sleep it off, and these aristocratic personages are no exception. Having caroused 'Til wel ny the day bigan to sprynge' (346), they now stayed in bed until 'pryme large' (360), or nine in the morning, an unusually late hour in Chaucer's England (or Tartary). Canacee, however, is up betimes.

She was ful mesurable, as wommen be;  
For of hir fader hadde she take leve  
To goon to reste soone after it was eve.  
Hir liste nat appalled for to be,  
Ne on the morwe unfeestlich for to se,  
And slepte hire firste sleep, and thanne awook.<sup>2</sup> (362-7.)

The maiden's father and his lords had behaved with typical male disregard of the golden mean, but womanly Canacee was more prudent: she didn't want to have a hangover. 'Cambuskan bold' loses something of his romantic aura as a result of his being thus subtly compared with his more reasonable daughter, but at the same time the poet has been thoroughly in his element for a considerable number of highly entertaining lines.

We must on with romance, however. Canacee awoke,

For swich a joye she in hir herte took  
Bothe of hir queynte ryng and hire mirour,  
That twenty tyme she changed hir colour;  
And in hire sleep, right for impressioun  
Of hire mirour, she hadde a visioun. (368-72.)

Excitement and anticipation caused her to awaken at an unusually early hour ('er that the sonne gan up glyde' [373]). She called upon her duenna

<sup>1</sup> I here follow Manly in taking 'of which ther nys no charge' to be a restrictive clause, and so omit the comma which Robinson has after 'dreem'. Not all dreams were without significance, but those caused by fumes were. Robinson directs our attention to Pard. T. (C 562-72) and Manly to N.P.T. (B<sup>2</sup> 4111-14). Note, however, that Pard. T., cited by Robinson, contains the better passage to explain Manly's punctuation; Pertelote did not believe in dreams at all. And the Pardoner, like Cambyuskan, is directly concerned with over-abundance of wine, whereas Pertelote is thinking of over-abundance of humours.

<sup>2</sup> H. B. Hinkley, *Notes on Chaucer* (Northampton, 1907), p. 230, says of line 362: 'This has rightly been pointed out as an illustration of Chaucer's delicate observation. Women require less sleep than men.' Do they? The question is beside the point. Since Canacee went to bed early and got up early, whereas Cambyuskan went to bed late and got up late, it would seem that she got just as much sleep as he did. Chaucer means that she is moderate in her pleasures.



('hir maistresse hire bisyde' [374]),<sup>1</sup> and announced her intention of getting up. At this point the comic spirit again interposes. The old woman was something of a busybody.

Thise olde wommen that been gladly wyse,  
As is hire maistresse, answerde hire anon,  
And seyde, 'Madame, whider wil ye goon  
Thus erly, for the folk been alle on reste?'<sup>2</sup> (376-9.)

Is surprised and aged prudence to stand in the way of youth's impatient activity? There is only one way to deal with the maddening wisdom of the very old: reassert one's will without explaining one's motive, and lead the old one to a bald conclusion:

'I wol,' quod she, 'arise, for me leste  
Ne lenger for to slepe, and walke aboute.' (380-1.)

Walk about she does on as pretty a spring morning as any in Chaucer (393-400). The story is not getting anywhere, however, and Chaucer realizes the fact. On with the plot! Characterization and setting must not predominate here! Humorously the poet resolves to settle down to the complication of events; there is a knot to be tied, and an intricate one (401-8). But, as it turns out, he balks at the first loop. The Canacee-falcon episode cannot hold his interest. He leaves it unfinished, and, as Lounsbury pointed out, what there is of it is not very carefully done.<sup>3</sup>

Lounsbury also showed that Part One had been written with greater care, that it did not contain the violations of grammar, the inconsistencies, and the awkward transitions of Part Two.<sup>3</sup> But even if Part One is better done in some ways than Part Two, it still causes the poet difficulty in maintaining unity of tone.

A chief difficulty is his unwillingness to go into elaborate description of courtly celebrations, courtly people, and courtly speeches. This unwillingness is more than the mere desire to avoid prolixity. It indicates a good deal about Chaucer's literary values. Not only did he consider some subjects tedious; he also thought them somewhat ridiculous, and he could not refrain from making subtle and humorous insinuations at their expense.

<sup>1</sup> See Manly's note (*C.T.*, p. 602).

<sup>2</sup> Robinson explains: 'Her governess, like these old women who are usually inquisitive, answered at once', and for the unusual meaning 'usually' of 'gladly' points to *N.P.T.*, B<sup>2</sup> 4414. See also Manly's note (p. 602). Hinckley (p. 224) also argues strongly in favour of 'usually', with special reference to F 224. I see no reason, however, for thinking that 'wyse' means 'inquisitive'. 'Prudent' or 'wise' will do, and in that case the force of 'gladly' may be, 'They like to think themselves wise'. The translation 'inquisitive' seems to stretch the meaning of 'wyse' too much, and certainly, if we take 'wyse' to mean 'wise', then Chaucer does not intend to say that wisdom is a quality *usually* possessed by old women of the type treated so summarily by Canacee.

<sup>3</sup> *Studies in Chaucer* (New York, 1892), iii. 317-18.

There is humour in Chaucer's refusal to describe Canacee's beauty:

But for to telle yow al hir beautee,  
It lyth nat in my tonge, n'yn my konnyng;  
I dar not undertake so heigh a thyng.  
Myn Englissh eek is insufficient.  
It moste been a rethor excellent,  
That koude his colours longynge for that art,  
If he sholde hire discryven every part.  
I am noon swich, I moot speke as I kan.<sup>1</sup> (34-41.)

Chaucer seems here to avoid the tedious, itemized descriptions of the rhetoricians.<sup>2</sup> He may also have had his eye humorously cocked at conventional descriptions in romances, for in chivalric literature the formal portrait or *effictio* 'became the almost invariable method of presenting feminine beauty'.<sup>3</sup> Two romances which Chaucer is almost certain to have known well—*Libeaus Desconus* and *Guy of Warwick*—contain just such description of a heroine as Chaucer refuses to provide for Canacee. He prefers to use the itemizing technique when he has a real human being worthy of his attention; hence we have the wife in the Miller's Tale, and the Wyf of Bath. Canacee is for the moment a colourless romantic *ingénue*, and he lets her alone until he comes to Part Two, where he sees an opportunity of doing something with her. In thus neglecting her, he not only uses the familiar rhetorical device of *occupatio*, but also exhibits glee in the avoidance of a rhetorical trap. Had he given us a description of Canacee according to the 'colours', he might have produced something like the model for description of a woman in Gaufred de Vinsauf's *Nova Poetria*.<sup>4</sup> With Gaufred in mind, we may well approve Chaucer's wisdom in leaving Canacee unitemized, but we may also consider that some exposition of the traits of so important a heroine would (if it were good) serve to arouse our interest in her. Cambyuskan, who has no important part to play in the development of the plot so far as it goes, is described at some length (12-27), but Canacee, who figures so largely in Part Two, is not described at all. Chaucer seems to fear that the description might not be good; the subject-matter makes him uncomfortable, and he dismisses it with a jest.

Is he winking humorously when he says that to give an account of Cambyuskan's menu would 'occupe a someres day' (64)? How much sly wit is

<sup>1</sup> The lines may, of course, be taken to represent the Squire's modesty. But in the *General Prologue* we learn that the young man had some literary ability—he could compose the words for songs ('endite', A 95)—and if Chaucer had wanted to describe Canacee's charms, he could have omitted the disclaimer of rhetorical ability.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the satirical reference to Geoffrey de Vinsauf in N.P.T., B<sup>2</sup> 4537-41.

<sup>3</sup> L. A. Haselmayer, 'The Portraits in Chaucer's Fabliaux', *R.E.S.* xiv (1938), 310.

<sup>4</sup> E. Faral, *Les Arts poétiques du XII<sup>e</sup> et du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1924), pp. 214-15, ll. 563-97.

there in lines 65-75? At least an elvish elusiveness is discernible. If, in this exotic tale, foreign marvels are not to be described, what *is* to be done? Why not charm the reader with oriental colour? Material on the oriental bill of fare was available, whether in print or in rumour;<sup>1</sup> the *Epistola Presbyteri Johanni: ad Emmanuelem regem Graecorum* was known in England in Chaucer's time.<sup>2</sup> Chaucer was a bookish man, well able to look up material he needed, and in the habit of doing so. In the *Epistola* he might have learned that some of Prester John's subjects considered it 'a most holy thing to eat human flesh', and that others thought the large ants of India a delicacy.<sup>3</sup> Admittedly a picture of Canacee and Cambyuskan eating ants would not have helped the atmosphere of the story; it follows that if Chaucer was familiar with the *Epistola* or with other similar accounts, written or spoken, he was amused at the thought of what he was holding back from his readers; there is ironic understatement in these three lines:

EEK in that lond, as tellen knyghtes olde,  
 Ther is some mete that is ful deynte holde,  
 That in this lond men recche of it but smal. . . . (69-71.)

At any rate, the *Gawain* poet would not have thought some sort of elaborate description a 'los of tyme', and Chaucer's thinking so indicates either his ingrained distaste for a certain kind of detail or his willingness to joke about his poetic matter.

Chivalric courtesy appears to be the poet's butt when he is introducing the strange knight's long speech describing the magic gifts (89-109). In lines 105-8, where Chaucer probably puns on 'style' and 'stile,' he suggests that from the everyday, commonsense point of view ('as to commune entente'), a plain summary of the Knight's words will indicate his meaning well enough; the aristocratic preoccupation with fine words and elaborate speeches is like the rhetorical *effictio* in having something laughable about it.

Courtly social behaviour is treated with a kind of light and tender humour in the lines (275-90) dealing with the revelry and dancing and dissimulation of love-looks at Cambyuskan's court.

Still,

Who koude telle yow the forme of daunces  
 So unkouth, and so fresshe contenaunces,  
 Swich subtil lookyng and dissymulynges

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Manly, *C.T.*, p. 599, n. to ll. 67-71: 'Chaucer had heard in some way of the strange foods eaten by the Tartars. Skeat thinks his information came from Marco Polo, but rumors concerning the strange things eaten in Tartary were as common then as those concerning Chinese foods are now.'

<sup>2</sup> J. L. Lowes, 'The Squire's Tale and the Land of Prester John', *Washington University Studies*, i, part ii (1913), pp. 1-18, especially p. 14; H. S. V. Jones in *Sources and Analogues* (Chicago, 1941), p. 358.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 359.

For drede of jalouse mennes aperceyvynge?

No man but Launcelot, and he is deed.

Therefore I passe of al this lustiheed;

I say namoore, but in this jolynesse

I lete hem, til men to the soper dresse. (283-90; italics mine.)

The lines call to mind a delightful scene, but at the same time there is the subtly humorous refusal to go into detail, seen especially in the reference to the narrator (who may be thought of as either the Squire or Chaucer) as a dull man, and in 'No man but Launcelot, and he is deed'. Elusive humour there is also in the lines:

He moste han knowen love and his servyse,

And been a feestlych man as fressh as May,

That sholde yow devysen swich array. (280-2.)

Either Chaucer is deliberately making the Squire modestly and wittily inconsistent with what has been said about him in the *General Prologue*, or else he is here, as elsewhere, whimsically referring to himself as a man who is not in the swim where love is concerned.

In Part One, then, Chaucer's manner of humorously shying away from detail gives him opportunities for humour, a humour which prevents us from considering the tale a typical romance. In connexion with the magic gifts, however, far from making use of light, rather nervous *occupatio*, he perhaps says rather too much—or, more precisely, lets his own personality appear inappropriately and to the spoiling of the romantic effect. A comparison with the analogue *Li Roumans de Cleomadès par Adenès li Rois*<sup>1</sup> will serve to make clear the Chaucerian quality of the Squire's Tale.

Adenès treats the magic horse (for him a wooden one) and the other magic devices with more *naïveté* than Chaucer. I do not mean that Adenès literally believes in all that he hears about magic; but, no doubt for the sake of romantic effect, he at least consistently affects to do so, whereas Chaucer does not. People of small understanding, says Adenès, ask him how such things as those of which he has spoken can be done. 'And do you know what I say to them?' he asks. 'I say to them that necromancy is a very marvellous branch of learning; for many marvels have been performed by means of it, one knows that well.'<sup>2</sup> And various marvels of Virgil are called to mind by the poet himself, whereas Chaucer lets the people in his story make most of the references to mythology and legend. In Chaucer the 'lewed peple' (221), buzzing like a swarm of bees (204), and ever deeming the worst because they are ignorant of what they are talking about (220-4), exclaim over numerous parallels to the gifts. Their wondering on the horse

<sup>1</sup> As quoted and summarized by Jones, *op. cit.*, pp. 365-74.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 367, ll. 1639-48.

of brass was so great that since the downfall of Troy, when men wondered at a horse also, there had not been such a wondering (305-8). Particularly amusing is one scatterbrain's fear that the horse may contain armed men:

'Myn herte,' quod oon, 'is everemoore in drede;  
I trowe som men of armes been therinne,  
That shapen hem this citee for to wynne.  
It were right good that al swich thyng were knowe.' (212-15.)

And yet, if we accept the horse of brass in the first place by a willing suspension of disbelief, then there ought to be nothing nonsensical about the parallels sought by the jangling ones. Why should Chaucer thus ridicule them slyly? Or is that his main intention? The lines which suggest ridicule are separated by stretches of allusion and speculation. Does Chaucer feel that calling to mind various marvellous trappings of history and mythology will add a romantic glow to his story?

Why, then, does he have the simple castle folk attempt scientific explanations of the marvels?

And somme of hem wondred on the mirour  
That born was up into the maister-tour,  
Hou men myghte in it swiche thynges se.  
Another answerde, and seyde it myghte wel be  
Naturelly, by composiciouns  
Of anglis and of slye reflexiouns,  
And seyde that in Rome was swich oon.  
They speken of Alocen, and Vitulon,  
And Aristotle, that writen in hir lyves  
Of queynte mirours and of perspectives,  
As knowen they that han hir bookes herd.

But nathelees somme seiden [*à propos* of Canacee's ring] that it was  
Wonder to maken of fern-asshen glas,  
And yet nys glas nat lyk asshen of fern;  
But, for they han yknowen it so fern,  
Therefore cesseth hir janglyng and hir wonder.  
As soore wondren somme on cause of thonder,  
On ebbe, on flood, on gossomer, and on myst,  
And alle thyng, til that the cause is wist.  
Thus jangle they, and demen, and devyse. . . . (225-35; 253-61.)

The learned tone in 225-35 and the commonsense tone in 253-61 are unromantic, and incongruous in the romantic setting. Chaucer imparts to his swarm of ignorant bees the realistic attitude taken by Jean de Meung and Dame Nature in the *Roman de la Rose*.<sup>1</sup> In the references to Alocen

<sup>1</sup> Resemblances between Sq. T. and R.R. are noted in D. S. Fansler, *Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose* (New York, 1914), pp. 36-7; E. Koeppel, 'Chauceriana', *Angl. xiv*

(the Arab generally known as Alhazen) and Aristotle, Chaucer echoes (whether consciously or unconsciously) Nature's admiring citation of these scientists as authorities in the field of optics.<sup>1</sup> Nature embodies much of De Meung's knowledge of the physical sciences, and also his antagonism toward superstitious belief in the supernatural. Those who, having seen what fantastic visions can be created by the use of mirrors, say that they have seen the devils at work are fools.<sup>2</sup> Vitulon (the Pole Vitello who translated and added to Alhazen's book on optics) is not mentioned by De Meung, and so we may suppose that Chaucer echoes not necessarily the *Roman* but perhaps simply the very considerable reputation which the three experts on optics enjoyed during the Middle Ages. Alhazen 'was one of the most important mathematicians and physicists of the Arabs . . . [His] *Optics* . . . had a great influence in the middle ages on the study of optics in Europe from Roger Bacon to Kepler'.<sup>3</sup> Vitello enjoyed similar prestige,<sup>4</sup> and the third book of Aristotle's *Meteorology*, embodying the results of his researches in perspective and optics, was known to the Middle Ages in Latin translations from the Arabic.<sup>5</sup> Regardless of the exact source of the knowledge displayed by the swarm of bees, it is curious that they should murmur so like the arch-realist Jean de Meung. They do so more specifically when they speak of making glass from fern-ashes. De Meung, in referring to this process, is illustrating the alchemical point that many substances can be reduced to one chemical common denominator; and he takes alchemy to be a serious and worthwhile science.<sup>6</sup> Thunder, he says, is not (as some foolishly suppose) caused by demons, but is simply the result of the natural actions of winds and storms operating under celestial influence;<sup>7</sup> 'vapour' is one of the accompanying phenomena.<sup>8</sup> Now on what basis can we accept such realism as appropriate in the Squire's Tale? It might be argued that since we are to accept the strange knight's gifts as truly magical, Chaucer's intention is to make the people seem foolish for taking a realistic attitude in a fantastic situation. But in that case he is inconsistent, for the folk were romantic enough in their classical allusions. They

. . . maden skiles after hir fantasies,  
Rehercyng of thise olde poetries, (205-6.)

(1892), 257-8; F. P. Magoun, 'Chaucer and the Roman de la Rose, vv. 16096-105', *Romanic Review*, xvii (1926), 69-70.

<sup>1</sup> *Roman*, ed. E. Langlois, S.A.T.F., 1914 ff., ll. 18024-60 (Alhazen and Aristotle), 18197-206 (Aristotle only).

<sup>2</sup> ll. 18231-8; 18275-86.

<sup>3</sup> *The Encyclopaedia of Islām* (London, 1927), ii. 382 a.

<sup>4</sup> L. Thorndike, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York, 1923), ii. 456.

<sup>5</sup> F. H. Fobes, 'Mediaeval Versions of Aristotle's *Meteorology*', *Classical Philology*, x (1915), 297-300; Langlois, op. cit., notes (iv. 313, 314) to 18031, 18200-6.

<sup>6</sup> ll. 16096-148.

<sup>7</sup> ll. 17880-912.

<sup>8</sup> ll. 17885-91.



or, in other words, called upon imagination rather than upon reason. Were they, then, ridiculously imaginative in some of their sayings, and ridiculously reasonable in others? It is possible that idle jangling could embody both faults, but the effect is confusing and lacking in unity of impression. And, finally, it may be asked whether, in a piece which sets out to be seriously romantic, it is effective to have the extras prick the bubble world of the principal actors with the pin of common sense. Chaucer—intellectual, sensible, pragmatic—makes himself felt in these references to ancient and medieval scientific notions, although he suggests scientific explanations by dramatic methods only, and, for himself, sidesteps the question of the proper tempering for a magic sword, about which he does not know enough to speak (243-6).

Chaucer lingers unnecessarily over the people and their speculations. His lively interest in human nature keeps him from his story, just as in Part Two. And so the very human crowd in the Squire's Tale babbles out that sort of comparison which, in *Cleomadès*, is presented in all seriousness by the poet himself. But even Chaucer's supposedly unintellectual mob is in some ways fairly sophisticated—more so than Adenès, certainly. The result is that Chaucer's lines are confusing. The poet himself, it is possible, does not know precisely what he is trying to do: belittle the garrulous mob, obtain romantic effect by suggesting a whole tradition of magic gadgets, or dabble in scientific speculation. Because of Chaucer's livelier mind and keener interest in human beings, the passage is, of course, much more interesting than its parallel in *Cleomadès*, just as the tale as a whole is more interesting than many romances. Yet these very qualities of superiority prevent Chaucer from achieving a uniformly romantic tone.

It will be noticed that I say that Chaucer does not achieve a *uniformly* romantic tone. That romance is present I should be the last to deny. Canacee's pretty morning joy in her ring and mirror is not only romance—it is romance intensified and burnished to splendid golden tones which make a *Beves* seem like some battered brass bedstead, and gold there is too in Cambyuskan's kingship and the lusty weather and the loud minstrelsy, in vapour gliding from the earth, in pity running soon in gentle heart, in 'wyn, in all this melodye' (292). Is it fair or decorous to say that Canacee didn't want to have a hangover, when Chaucer himself certainly does not state the idea so baldly but instead displays considerable delicacy, saying that the maiden did not want to be fatigued, worn out, 'appalled' in the morning, that she did not want 'unfeestlich for to se' or in other words to have the carnival spirit of high festivity depart from her? There is a fine subtlety and a tender hedonism here; in that joyful early awakening, fair, fresh Canacee reaps her reward for abstinence. But Cambyuskan loses dignity by our comparing him with his daughter, and Chaucer's humour is of a

heartier kind when Sleep with gaping mouth kisses all the revellers and bids them cherish blood, which bidding they respect with gaping thanks and take for the best. Even so, in the grotesqueness of this image of the yawning kiss there may be something of romance. A general truth is well put by J. W. Mackail when he says that Chaucer '... carries romance even into his comedy, as he carries his comedy even into romance', that 'This is what gives his work so complex and intricate a fascination'.<sup>1</sup>

Yet it does not appear that in the Squire's Tale Chaucer achieves a consistent harmony between his subtly shifting moods and the substance of his story. His excessive use of whimsical *occupatio* betrays a certain skittishness, an uncomfortable awareness that all is not well with him in these strange regions, and when the folk debate in ignorant-wise fashion about the magic gifts we do not have fine weaving of various poetic threads but, rather, artistic confusion. And whether the richest passage of all (the first fifty-three lines of Part Two) be sly in humour or skilful in delicate counterpoint of high comedy with high romantic sentiment, it fits ill with the rest of the story; and so with what is surely reluctance (though humorous) the poet 'condescends' to his tale and makes of that matchless sunrise promenade an immediate end, while we share his feeling and wish that Canacee had had to walk through whole parks full of vapour and gay Chaucerian songsters before she found the falcon. The best lines in the tale have to do with human comedy, and human joys and pleasures of the natural world, rather than specifically with the ring and the mirror and the sword and the horse of brass whereon the Tartar king did or did not ride. This is what happens, as it seems to me: precisely those traits which we most love in Chaucer—sagacious realism, humour, critical intellect, subtlety of mood, and natural human gusto—keep him from maintaining the wide-eyed *naïveté* and quaint curiosity required by his theme, and make him realize that it is better to abandon his attempt to force an entrance into fairyland than to get stuck in a magic casement.

<sup>1</sup> *Springs of Helicon* (New York, 1909), pp. 58-9.

## RULE A WIFE AND HAVE A WIFE AND EL SAGAZ ESTACIO

By EDWARD M. WILSON

WARWICK BOND, in his introduction to *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, remarks that: 'For the main plot (Leon, Margarita, and the Duke) no direct source has hitherto been indicated beyond some obvious general example in *The Taming of the Shrew*, which is, however, sufficiently distinct. Hallam, while owning a likelihood of some Spanish prototype, recognized native qualities in the variety and spirit of character and the vivacious humour. Indeed the vigour of Leon's part throughout suggests that the author is working on a conception of his own.'<sup>1</sup> Bond notes how the main plot is interwoven with the sub-plot, which, as is well known, derives from a French translation of Cervantes's novel *El casamiento engañoso*, and adds: 'A germ at least for Leon and Margarita is furnished in the Doña Clementa and Don Lope of Cervantes's novel; the duenna might suggest the complaisant old ladies of I. iv; and a further distinct leaning upon the tale is noticeable in the transfer of Estefania's *cousinship with a former lover* to Margarita and Duke (cf. Leon's satirical "What cousin's this?", IV. iii. 126, following lines 97, 99). But the vigorous Leon remains without a forerunner.'<sup>2</sup> This essay will attempt to prove that Fletcher's main plot is largely derived from Alonso Jerónimo de Salas Barbadillo's novel *El sagaz Estacio marido examinado*.

*Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* was licensed in 1624.<sup>3</sup> In 1613 Salas Barbadillo was granted permission to print a book entitled *El sagaz Estacio marido examinado* in the kingdom of Aragon, but there is no trace of an edition of this work before 1620,<sup>4</sup> when it was published in Madrid. It was not translated into English during the seventeenth century and, though

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher Variorum Edition*, iii. 364.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 365.

<sup>3</sup> The critics are agreed that Fletcher had no collaborator in this play. Beaumont died in 1616 and no other hand has been detected in it.

<sup>4</sup> There is an imperfect copy of the first edition in the British Museum and a good copy of another edition of the following year. The *Suma del Privilegio de Aragón* may be found in the preliminaries to either of these editions or in the convenient reprint of Francisco A. Icaza: Salas Barbadillo, *La peregrinación sabia y El sagaz Estacio, marido examinado* (Madrid, Clásicos castellanos, 1924). My quotations are from this edition, which is usually reliable (see, however, p. 190, n. 2). The two early editions are described by Cotarelo in his preface to Salas Barbadillo, *Obras* (Madrid, 1907), i. lxxvi-lxxvii. Icaza's transcription of the title-page of the 1620 edition does not tally with Cotarelo's, which is that of the British Museum copy; perhaps there were two editions of 1620.

For a general account of Salas Barbadillo's life and works, see the prefaces of Cotarelo and Icaza, also that of E. B. Place to Alonso Jerónimo de Salas Barbadillo, *La casa del placer honesto* (Boulder, Colorado, 1927).

there was a French translation, it did not appear in print until 1634.<sup>1</sup> If Fletcher read the novel he must have read it in Spanish.

Like the *Celestina*, the *Sagaz Estacio* is a novel written in dialogue throughout. Salas Barbadillo called it a 'Comedia en prosa' and divided it into three acts, but it was certainly not intended to be acted. In the dedication to Agustín Fiesco, Salas acknowledged a debt to Italian models as well as to the *Celestina*, and he stressed the fact that his intention was, like that of Rojas, a strictly moral one. No recent Spanish writer has specified what Salas took from Italian sources, and his words ('ser esta comedia en prosa a imitación de tantas como hoy corren en Italia') may well apply only to the form that his novel took. The moral intention may not be apparent to every twentieth-century reader, but that is not necessarily the fault of the author: critics have often assumed that, because the subject-matter of a work is disagreeable, the work itself cannot be edifying.

*El sagaz Estacio* has a sub-plot that is irrelevant to my theory. The main plot is as follows:

Doña Marcela, a Madrid courtesan, tells her lover don Pedro<sup>2</sup> that she is looking for a compliant husband because she is afraid that, if she does not marry, she will be arrested. Her husband must allow her her own way and not interfere with her goings-on. Pedro and a servant named Medina propose various candidates, but Marcela gives witty reasons for refusing them. After a number of different persons has been considered and rejected, the matchmaker Sánchez comes in to introduce Estacio, whom he recommends to Marcela as the ideal husband for her. In order to test Estacio she arranges that Pedro shall call her 'cousin' and behave affectionately towards her throughout the interview. Estacio is shown in and he convinces Marcela of his desirability by praising her behaviour towards Pedro: if a woman habitually caresses a lover, she will caress her husband even more! Estacio also tells them how he himself used to go out to look for suitable 'cousins' for his deceased wife, and how she supported him. Pedro and Sánchez urge Marcela to accept this consenting cuckold. She,

<sup>1</sup> Place, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> There is an unfortunate mistake in Icaza's edition in the list of those who take part in the dialogue. The first edition reads:

Don Pedro Cauallero.

Salazar, Soria, y Medina sus criados. . . .

Instead of which Icaza put:

Don Pedro Salazar, caballero.

Soria y Medina, sus criados. . . .

The lists are all incomplete; none includes the ruffians Ahumado and Montúfar and the singer of *seguidillas* in the last act. On page 204 of Icaza's edition there is also a mistake that should be corrected. Don Sancho's speech beginning 'Es tan honrado el señor Estacio, y tan macizo en bondad . . .' should, from the context, be given to Sánchez. The first edition also wrongly attributes the lines to 'D. Sanc. (fol. 81 b).

however, insists on making further inquiries and on his producing witnesses to vouch for his suitability. Estacio agrees to this request (pp. 89-121).

Salazar and Medina, Pedro's servants, call on Estacio at his lodging to investigate his character. They tell him that the marriage will be unhappy because Marcela's reputation is tainted and his honour will suffer thereby. Estacio protests against the servants' disloyal slander and swoons in indignation. Salazar grows suspicious of him, but Medina is convinced that Estacio is the man they want for Marcela. When Estacio recovers they take him to a doorway opposite her house, from which they all watch the wealthy occupants of a coach alight and enter her door. Estacio makes an ambiguous statement that leaves the two servants puzzled (pp. 150-70).

In the second act Marcela tells Soria how pleased she is with Estacio, who has arranged for the witnesses to call on her before the appointed time. Pedro and Salazar join the others, and Salazar reveals his suspicions. Estacio produces his witnesses, who tell extravagant stories of his mildness as a man and complaisance as a husband. Even the sceptical Salazar is convinced, and Marcela says she will take Estacio as her husband (pp. 197-237).

In the middle of the last act Marcela tells Sánchez that she will marry Estacio that night. Estacio expatiates to Medina on the prospects that the future holds for him, and explains how he is to be admitted to the order of the 'complaisant' that afternoon (pp. 267-75).

Medina attends this ceremony and afterwards gives the ruffians Ahumado and Montúfar an account of the burlesque initiation. Don Pedro and don Sancho join them and all go to visit Marcela after her marriage. At her house Estacio keeps them at bay with a musket and leaves a paper with Pedro in which he explains that as a thank-offering after a storm at sea he made a vow to reform a prostitute; he had consciously deceived them all in order to bring this virtuous action to a close, and Marcela had consented to her own reformation. Pedro persuades the others not to molest the pair as Estacio had undertaken a pious duty (pp. 293-303).

Unless there is an undiscovered source or derivative of the Spanish novel, Fletcher must have taken from it at least part of the main plot of *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*. Margarita, as Bond noted, has some of the attributes of Doña Clementa of *El casamiento engañoso*, but essentially she is the Marcela of *El sagaz Estacio*. Leon is obviously copied from Estacio himself and the Duke of Medina to some extent resembles don Pedro. Scenes II. i, II. iii, III. i, and III. v of the play tell the same story as I have summarized from the novel. We may also notice that the names of two of Fletcher's characters occur in the novel, though their roles are different: Fletcher gives us a Duke of Medina and an officer called Sanchio; Salas has a servant called Medina and a gentleman called don Sancho.

At times the play follows the novel closely. Act II, scene i, consists

almost entirely of passages imitated from the original. Margarita tells her ladies that she must marry; she will be penniless if the law strips her for incontinence. Marcela talks of a 'black fear of justice, the shadow of which, though no greater than that of a wand, frightens me and causes disquiet in my frail heart'.<sup>1</sup> Altea (or the fourth lady in the 1640 quarto) states that Margarita wants:

A husband of an easy faith a foole,  
Made by her wealth, and moulded to her pleasure,  
One though he see himselfe become a monster,  
Shall hold the doore, and entertaine the maker. (ll. 25-8.)

Marcela's husband must have similar qualities. Pedro and Medina offered Marcela a number of possible husbands, beginning with a doctor and soldier (pp. 92, &c.); the ladies offer Margarita a lawyer (ll. 34-8) and a 'grave governor' (ll. 39-42). Although the candidates are different in the two works, the device of the choice and the refusal can hardly have occurred independently to the two authors. Although Altea depicts Leon as a mild, but lusty, soldier, and Estacio (though he may really have been a soldier in the past) is supposed to be meek and timid, both are described as great eaters.<sup>2</sup> The closest parallel between the two works that I have been able to find occurs towards the end of this scene in Fletcher's play. Margarita and Altea are still discussing Leon:

*Margarita.* Is he so goodly a man doe you say?

[*Altea.*]

As you shall see Lady,

But to all this is but a trunke.

*Margarita.*

I would have him so,

I shall adde branches to him to adorne him. (ll. 58-62.)

In the novel Marcela says: 'I am looking for a husband who will not be a complete one, but a stock, a tree, I mean, who will shield me from the strength of this sun [that is, of Justice] with his shadow; for I will fit him for that task by putting branches on his head.'<sup>3</sup> The similarity of the conceits is obvious; perhaps Fletcher really knew a little Spanish.<sup>4</sup>

Fletcher and Salas Barbadillo had to deal with the same problem in

<sup>1</sup> ll. 7-8. 'Este negro temor de la justicia, cuya sombra, con ser tan pequeña la que hace una vara, me espanta y causa inquietud en mi corazón flaco' (p. 90).

<sup>2</sup> 'If honour lye in eating, he is right honorable', says Altea, II. i. 57. The Capitán says of Estacio: 'es hombre que jamás se le han visto cerradas las ganas de comer' (p. 223).

<sup>3</sup> 'Por esto busco yo un esposo que no sea marido entero, sino un leño, un árbol digo, que defienda con su sombra contra la fuerza deste sol, que yo le habilitaré para ello poniéndole las ramas sobre la cabeza' (p. 91).

<sup>4</sup> Macaulay, in his chapter on Beaumont and Fletcher in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (vol. vi), repeats the doubts of previous scholars about this question: 'it has been questioned whether he was acquainted with the Spanish language' (p. 124). Bond (op. cit., p. 361) admits that Fletcher probably read Spanish. Baldwin Maxwell is 'not so certain as some critics have been of Fletcher's small knowledge of Spanish'. [*Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger* (Chapel Hill, 1939), p. 107].



making their heroes palatable to the public. To avoid the reproach of inconsistency and of the undue straining of the sympathy of audience and reader, they had, before the fact was made plain, to hint that the apparent wittol was not a wittol at all. Leon's martial appearance<sup>1</sup> doubtless indicated his manliness, even before he began to speak; Salas, however, had to prove not merely Estacio's virility but his virtue also, consequently the sagacious Staius is often subtle in speech and not ashamed to show his piety.<sup>2</sup> Marcela is determined not to be the victim of deception, but such an idea never enters Margarita's head. Salazar's doubts about Estacio are perhaps echoed by don Juan de Castro's aside during the first scene in which Leon appears:

This fellow has some doubts in's talk that striks me,  
He cannot be all foole.

But this situation is much simpler than the other. Usually Fletcher stresses the contrast between Leon's actions and his words; though bashful, he answers Cacafo's blow by a kick. Again, in his first scene with Margarita, his conversation is meek and timid, but he kisses her heartily enough:

*Margarita.* And when you see her friends here,  
Or noble kinsmen, can you enttaine  
Their servants in the Celler, and be busied,  
And hold your peace, what ere you see or heare of.

*Leon.* Twere fit I were hang'd else.

*Margarita.* Let me try your kisses,  
How the foole shakes, I will not eat ye sir,  
Beshrew my heart he kisses wondrous manly. . . . (II. iii. 23-9.)

And later in the same scene:

*Leon.* Ile be a dog to please ye.

*Margarita.* Indeed you must fetch and carry as I appoint ye.

*Leon.* I were too blame else.

*Margarita.* Kiss me agen; a strong fellow,  
There is a vigor in his lips. . . . (52-5.)

Fletcher had no scruples about using the same trick twice in a scene, and the trick is a crude one. Salas Barbadillo employed more art and hinted at something more profound.

Not until the end of *El sagaz Estacio* is the true nature of the hero revealed, although it is implied before by the means I have mentioned. Fletcher, with *The Taming of the Shrew*<sup>3</sup> before him, chose rather to build a series of scenes in which Leon should show himself master in his own

<sup>1</sup> Baldwin Maxwell notes that the part was clearly designed for 'the tall fat fellow', John Lowen (op. cit., p. 74).

<sup>2</sup> See especially the scene between Estacio, Medina, and Salazar, pp. 150-70.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. D. M. McKeithan, *The Debt to Shakespeare in the Beaumont-and-Fletcher Plays* (Austin, Texas, 1938), pp. 129-33. Other critics have remarked on the parallel between the Margarita-Leon situation in this play and that of Morose and the 'silent woman'.

house. In III. i Leon reveals himself, but in such a way that Margarita can be persuaded by Altea that his outburst is merely the effect of wine. In III. v he defies and cows his wife, and is not afraid to provoke the Duke's anger. This is the climax of the play, and the later scenes (IV. iii, V. iii, and V. v) merely show how Leon is able to overcome the wiles by which the Duke strives unsuccessfully to continue his affair with Margarita. The greatest technical defect of the play is that the later scenes of the main plot are an anticlimax; virtually all is over at the end of the third act.<sup>1</sup> The scene in which Leon asserts himself has been much admired and there is in it an effective theatrical situation. Nevertheless, of all the scenes that Fletcher elaborated without direct imitation, the opening scene of the third act seems to me the best. We watch Leon's real indignation and feigned submission, Altea's deception, and Margarita's uncomprehending anger; and we also hear verse that is reminiscent of greater dramatic poets than Fletcher:

But what are husbands, read the new worlds wonders,  
Such husbands as this monstrous world produces,  
And you will scarce find such deformities,  
They are shadowes to conceale your veniall vertues,  
Sailes to your mills, that grinde with all occasions,  
Balls that lye by you, to wash out your staines,  
And bills nail'd up with horne before your stories,  
To rent out lust.<sup>2</sup> (III. i.)

Such lines are rare in *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*. The play has been praised, but the verse is often obvious and the dramatist relies on situations to carry him through. 'Malgré l'unité fort bien entendue qui règne dans cette pièce, formée de deux aventures très ingénieusement liées, puisque l'héroïne de l'une est la servante de l'héroïne de l'autre, nous avons là plutôt une succession d'épisodes amusants qu'une action qui se développe', wrote Chelli.<sup>3</sup> The situations are exploited rather than explored. Except in bawdy passages, Fletcher never implies more than he says; his admirers are driven to extol his outspoken gusto, never his subtlety. *El sagaz Estacio* is far from being one of the great Spanish seventeenth-century novels—it is often diffuse, frigid, and exaggerated—nevertheless it is wider in range, more sensitive in style, and more serious in morals than Fletcher's commonplace treatment of a similar theme.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'I have either read, or been inform'd (I know not well whether) that 'twas generally Mr. Fletcher's practice, after he had finish'd Three Acts of a Play to shew them to the Actors, and when they had agreed on Terms, he huddled up the two last without that care that behoov'd him; which gave opportunity to such Friends as Mr. Dryden to traduce him.' Gerard Langbaine, *An Account of the English Dramatick Poets* (Oxford, 1691), pp. 144-5.

<sup>2</sup> The 1640 quarto reads 'last'.

<sup>3</sup> Maurice Chelli, *Le Drame de Massinger* (Lyons, 1923), p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> I wish to thank Mr. John Crow for advice and help in preparing this article.

## WILLIAM WALSH AND DRYDEN: RECENTLY RECOVERED LETTERS

By PHYLLIS FREEMAN

ALTHOUGH five of Dryden's letters to William Walsh<sup>1</sup> have been known since their publication by Robert Bell in 1854,<sup>2</sup> it is only comparatively recently that some of Walsh's letters to Dryden have been recovered. In 1934 two letter-books of Walsh came to light which contained, among letters to various correspondents, eight unpublished letters to Dryden. The first of these, in a Bodleian manuscript of 1686,<sup>3</sup> was Walsh's earliest letter to Dryden in which 'without having the honour of being known to you or owning myself' he asked Dryden's opinion on some of his own poems. The remaining seven letters, in a British Museum manuscript of 1690-1,<sup>4</sup> trace the beginning and development of the friendship between the two poets.

The anonymous 1686 letter was published by me in an article<sup>5</sup> in which attention was drawn to the existence, but not to the number, of the letters in the British Museum manuscript and, perhaps for that reason, two of those letters were overlooked by the two American scholars who subsequently made use of the manuscript. Professor Osborn, in an analysis of some biographical problems connected with Dryden,<sup>6</sup> used the facts in the Bodleian letter and five of the British Museum letters as the basis of a section on Dryden and Walsh; and Professor Ward published the same six letters in his edition of Dryden's correspondence.<sup>7</sup> Both these editors assume that Dryden's first published letter to Walsh (in which he addresses Walsh as 'My deare Patron')<sup>8</sup> is in reply to the anonymous Bodleian letter, but since the date of Dryden's letter is accepted as 1690 and Walsh's is

<sup>1</sup> William Walsh (1662-1708) of Abberley, Worcestershire. All biographical accounts of Walsh give the date of his birth as 1663; but the old parish register of the ruined St. Michael's Church, Abberley, gives the date of Walsh's baptism as 6 October 1662.

<sup>2</sup> Introduction to *The Poetical Works of John Dryden*, ed. Robert Bell (London, 1854).

<sup>3</sup> Bodleian MS. Malone 9, an autograph MS. of William Walsh, 83 leaves, containing twenty first drafts of letters and a number of poems. The MS. is undated, but the date is determined by references to events which occurred in 1686, such as the deaths of Walsh's brother Walter and sister Katherine.

<sup>4</sup> British Museum Add. MS. 10434, an autograph MS. of William Walsh, 90 leaves, dated 1690-1, containing first drafts of letters (ff. 3<sup>r</sup>-78<sup>r</sup>) and poems (ff. 90<sup>r</sup>-78<sup>v</sup> of the reversed MS.). Thirty-seven of the letters are to Anne Pierrepont, seven to Dryden, and the rest to various correspondents.

<sup>5</sup> *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, vii (1934), No. 84.

<sup>6</sup> James Osborn, *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems* (New York, 1940).

<sup>7</sup> *The Letters of John Dryden*, ed. Charles Ward (Duke University Press, North Carolina, 1942).

<sup>8</sup> *Works*, ed. Scott-Saintsbury (London, 1882-93), xviii. 183.

included in the manuscript among letters which are shown by internal evidence to have been written in 1686, this assumption appears to be unwarrantable. The two earliest British Museum letters from Walsh<sup>1</sup> are replies to two of Dryden's published letters;<sup>2</sup> in them Walsh discusses Dryden's corrections of an epigram and an elegy sent him for criticism, and begs his opinion of the manuscript of Walsh's long prose work, the *Dialogue concerning Women*.<sup>3</sup> In the third letter<sup>4</sup> Walsh confides in Dryden his complicated motives for publishing the *Dialogue* and says that if Dryden would give himself 'ye trouble to write some little preface to it, it might [be] a very great means to recommend it to ye World'.

Walsh adds:

If you have leisure to do this, & don't think ye piece unworthy it, I will send you the Copy, w<sup>ch</sup> you may dispose of with ye same freedom as if it were yo<sup>r</sup> own, reserving mee a sufficient number Printed ones to dispose among my friends.

The fourth and fifth letters<sup>5</sup> deal in great detail with Walsh's design for a treatise 'of ye Nature of Love' and with the French, Italian, and classical authors whom Dryden has advised him to read in that connexion. There is also a certain amount of gossip about a common friend, Jane Leveson-Gower,<sup>6</sup> whose marriage to Lord Hyde was being delayed by his absence in Flanders with the King, and who appears to have been whiling away the interval by a semi-intellectual flirtation with the handsome author of the *Dialogue concerning Women*. As the two unpublished letters from Walsh to Dryden show, Dryden was taking a benevolent interest in the affair between his two young friends, and was commissioned by Jane Leveson-Gower to send Walsh a French translation she had made of one of his works, and by Walsh to pass on to the lady a love-poem,<sup>7</sup> with many coy injunctions from both sides to let the identities of the senders remain neither known nor unknown but merely guessed.

The fifth British Museum letter<sup>8</sup> (the last of those published by Pro-

<sup>1</sup> B.M. Add. MS. 10434, ff. 8<sup>r</sup>-9<sup>r</sup> and 9<sup>v</sup>-10<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, ed. Scott-Saintsbury, xviii. 183 and 180.

<sup>3</sup> William Walsh, *A Dialogue concerning Women, Being a Defence of the Sex, Written to Eugenia* (London, 1691).

<sup>4</sup> B.M. Add. MS. 10434, ff. 29<sup>r</sup>-30<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 55<sup>v</sup>-57<sup>v</sup> and 59<sup>v</sup>-61<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> Daughter of Sir William Leveson-Gower, of Trentham, Staffs., later wife of Henry, Lord Hyde.

<sup>7</sup> B.M. Add. MS. 10434, f. 79<sup>r</sup>. 'Song to Flavia', beginning 'Go, Bashful Swain, to Flavia tell. . .'

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 59<sup>v</sup>-61<sup>r</sup>. Professor Ward dates this letter as 'probably September or October 1691', but as it follows immediately on a letter in the MS. dated 17 August, and as it probably refers to an early stage of Dryden's illness which, by 7 October, had lasted six weeks (cf. Dryden's letter of that date to the Earl of Dorset), the earlier date seems likelier.

fessor Ward) is undated, but was probably written in late August or early September of 1691. Walsh's next letter follows at what appears to have been a fairly short interval on Dryden's reply, which has not been preserved, but which clearly continued with the discussion on French authors and with the matter of Jane Leveson-Gower's translation.

I have been making [Walsh wrote to Dryden] some little excursions into ye Neighbouring Countreyes; w<sup>ch</sup> was ye occasion y<sup>t</sup> I read not yo<sup>r</sup> letter till last night. I am glad to finde wee agree in o<sup>r</sup> Judgments of ye Fr. Authors w<sup>ch</sup> makes mee fancy I may bee in ye right; & you may believe I am not displeased y<sup>t</sup> a fair Lady & I shoud agree in any point. I am sorry y<sup>t</sup> I have brought you into such ill circumstances with 'em too; A Lady sent mee down a Copy of Verses since I came hither, ag<sup>t</sup> my Self. But they had brought in you & my Lady Dorchester by ye by as Friends of mine. If you have not seen it it is not worth ye sending you; And did I know ye Author I woud bee very severely revenged upon him, by showing it w<sup>th</sup> his Name to it. For ye fair Ladys Book if you will send it to ye French Booksellers at ye Golden Bible in ye Strand at ye End of Beaufort Street, & tell 'em it is for mee, they will send it w<sup>th</sup> some other books y<sup>t</sup> I have sent for, by ye Flying Coach, w<sup>ch</sup> comes in two days as well as ye Post. I am certainly engaged in Hon<sup>r</sup> to make some complim<sup>t</sup> to ye Lady upon it. For ye Song you may use yo<sup>r</sup> own Discretion either in telling or not telling ye name; Tho' if you do not tell it, I woud have it so orderd at least y<sup>t</sup> shee might guess it to bee mine. They tell mee there is a Match made between her & my Ld. Hyde, who is in Flanders w<sup>th</sup> ye Kg. However Marryd or Unmarryd I do not apprehend any danger from a fair Ladyes knowing I love her; w<sup>t</sup>ever some Women may think of mee. No Woman I take it is angry at a Mans loving her, how little soever shee may care for him; But for a Man not to value a Woman w<sup>n</sup> shee makes advances to him, is a thing y<sup>t</sup> shall never bee forgiven; as I have found to my own prejudice. I give you thanks for yo<sup>r</sup> News & am

Sr.<sup>1</sup>

Dryden must have complied with the request to send the book to Walsh at Abberley since, soon after, Walsh enclosed a complimentary letter to Jane Leveson-Gower in a covering letter to Dryden.

That you may not incurr ye fate of Bellerophon [Walsh wrote to Dryden] tho' I send you [a] letter y<sup>t</sup> is to bee deliverd to another, yet I send it open, y<sup>t</sup> you may see whether you think it fit to bee sent or no. If ye Lady layd an absolute command, y<sup>t</sup> shee shoud not bee known, it may not bee convenient to let her have it. If shee did not I am bound in Hon<sup>r</sup> to make her some sort of Complim<sup>t</sup> upon it. Wee ought to use Ladyes w<sup>th</sup> more respect y<sup>n</sup> wee do one another; & w<sup>t</sup> woud appear flattery to a Man, is but Civility to a Woman. Tho it must bee allowd y<sup>t</sup> so much Learning is very extraordinary in any one of her Age, tho they were of o<sup>r</sup> Sex. It is true I do not think ye translation extraordinarily well done, I have therefore avoided saying much upon y<sup>t</sup> point. I

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., ff. 61<sup>v</sup>-62<sup>r</sup>, unpublished.

have been so often abroad & had so much company w<sup>th</sup> mee w<sup>n</sup> I was at home, y<sup>t</sup> I have never been able to do any thing to ye Treatise of love yet. It is only an Embryo in ye Brain; & may for ought I know never go farther.

I am

Sr.<sup>1</sup>

The enclosed letter to Jane Leveson-Gower begins:

I violate a trust of friendship Madam in writing you this letter; but w<sup>t</sup> is a breach of friendship when there is a fair Lady in the case. Mr. Dryden told mee you had done mee ye hon<sup>r</sup> to translate a little treatise of mine into French, but hee told mee hee had not commission to tell mee who did it. However Madam having read a Copy of it from him, give mee leave at a venture to return you thanks for it. . . .<sup>2</sup>

The letter continues in Walsh's usual style of elaborate gallantry, expressing his wonder that such extreme youth and beauty should be combined with so much learning, and his pride that 'in this little Corner of ye World wee have produc't a Lady y<sup>t</sup> will efface ye glory of Greece and Rome'.

The passages in the letters to Dryden concerning the episode with Jane Leveson-Gower and the mention of Dryden's views on the French authors are self-explanatory when read in sequence with the other letters in the British Museum manuscript, but another passage in the first of the two letters cannot be explained without reference to the rather complicated background of intrigue behind the publication of the *Dialogue concerning Women*.

I am sorry [Walsh wrote] y<sup>t</sup> I have brought you into such ill circumstances with 'em [i.e. the ladies] too; A Lady sent mee down a Copy of Verses since I came hither, ag<sup>t</sup> my Self. But they had brought in you & my Lady Dorchester by ye by as Friends of mine. . . .<sup>3</sup>

The copy of verses to which Walsh refers was an anonymous lampoon which was circulated in the town after the publication of the *Dialogue concerning Women* with its complimentary preface by Dryden. The *Dialogue* was an immediate success, not only because it was a spirited 'Defence of the Sex' written by one of the most popular of the Will's Coffee House wits, nor even because it was sponsored by Dryden himself, but mainly because the London gossips were aware of the intrigue which had led to its publication. 'Eugenia', to whom the *Dialogue* was addressed, was Anne Pierrepont,<sup>4</sup> the recently widowed Countess of Kingston, whose

<sup>1</sup> B.M. Add. MS. 10434, ff. 64<sup>v</sup>-65<sup>r</sup>, unpublished.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., ff. 63<sup>v</sup>-64<sup>v</sup>, unpublished.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., f. 61<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Anne Greville, eldest daughter of 4th Baron Brooke. Married in 1682 William Pierrepont, 4th Earl of Kingston, who died in September 1690. Married, early in 1691, another William Pierrepont, a cousin of her first husband.



beauty and wealth were the cause of keen rivalry among her many suitors. Walsh's letters leave no room for doubt that he had been numbered among Lady Kingston's lovers before her husband's death<sup>1</sup> and at the time, early in her widowhood, when he wrote the *Dialogue* for her pleasure ('writt in haste', as he told Dryden, 'in obedience to the commands of a fair Lady'),<sup>2</sup> he was still hopeful that she would marry him. But before the publication of the *Dialogue*, in April 1691, there were rumours of Lady Kingston's secret marriage to another man and Walsh, in a jealous rage, threatened revenge.

However 'tis upon a particular reason [Walsh wrote to Dryden] y<sup>t</sup> I woud have it [i.e. the *Dialogue*] printed; of w<sup>ch</sup> I will make you Confident; The Lady to whom it is written has playd mee some scurvy trickes for which I may come to fall out publicly with her & because it is usual for all ye Sex to take one anothers part in these cases; I wou'd first print this Defence of 'em, to engage my self a party amongst 'em. . . .<sup>3</sup>

According to rumour, the public falling-out of which Walsh wrote to Dryden was to take the form of publishing Lady Kingston's letters to him. It is not certain whether Walsh seriously intended to take this unchivalrous revenge, since in the same letter in which he denies the rumour he both justifies that form of revenge and ends by offering to suppress the book.

I was told [Walsh wrote to Lady Kingston] last night at ye Musick meeting y<sup>t</sup> ye Town expected a second Edition of ye Dialogue concerning Women, wherein all yo<sup>r</sup> Letters to mee wou'd bee exposd; & some have told mee y<sup>t</sup> you also had said ye same thing. I can only assure you Madam y<sup>t</sup> I never had any such design. . . . But I confess Madam I have all along had a design of clearing my self & y<sup>t</sup> I told you, w<sup>ch</sup> was by publishing ye History of all ye Amours between us. . . . If you will bee sincere in ye thing & come to any reasonable composition ye Book shall bee yet suppressd & ye letters disposd of as you think fit. For upon cooler thoughts Madam I woud not make ye Woman I once loved more y<sup>n</sup> all ye World together a Jest to all her Enemies. . . .<sup>4</sup>

In the meantime, Lady Kingston and her friends had become agitated about the threatened scandal and Walsh was attacked by methods varying from a challenge to a duel to the anonymous lampoon mentioned in his

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., ff. 32<sup>r</sup>-32<sup>v</sup>. 'When shee went out of Town [probably July-August 1690], Walsh wrote retrospectively to a confidante of Lady Kingston's early in 1691, 'w<sup>n</sup> shee had forcet mee into ye most violent passion in ye World . . . shee went immediately w<sup>th</sup> my tears wet upon her face into ye arms of another man. When after this shee sent me a letter out of ye Country, to desire my assistance if any body shou'd discover her to her husband . . . I readily promised my service. . . .'

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., f. 9<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., ff. 29<sup>r</sup>-29<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., ff. 37<sup>v</sup>-39<sup>r</sup>.

letter to Dryden. This lampoon was entitled 'On the Author of a Dialogue concerning Women pretended to be writ in Defence of the Sex'<sup>1</sup> and ran:

Near Covent-Garden Theatre, where you know  
Poets their Sense, Players their Shapes do show,  
There is a Club of Critics of the Pit,  
Who do themselves admire for Men of Wit;  
And lo! an arbitrary Power assume  
On Plays and Ladies both to pass their Doom;  
Censure all Things and Persons, Priest and Prince,  
And judge them by the Standard of their Sense;  
But scan these Sparks, or by their Words or Mien,  
You'll find them Fop without and Fool within.  
One of these Brats dress'd up in Shape of Satire,  
Comes forth to be the Ladies Vindicator:  
And since for Chivalry he claims no Warrant,  
Instead of Knight sets up for Poet-errant.  
Bless us! said I, what mighty Hero's here?  
He thunders so, 'tis dangerous to come near.  
The beauteous Sex may set their Hearts at rest;  
Of all their Patrons, sure this is the best.  
The great dead-doing Champion of the Quill,  
Will all the Fry of leud Lampooners kill;  
Then to begin with Dryden's dreadful Name,  
Shou'd mark out something of no common Fame;  
But when the boasted Matter I had read,  
I found my Expectation was misled,  
And that the Poet, though he does pretend  
To do them justice, is no Woman's Friend.  
Misogynes is made to shoot with Ball,  
Philogynes allowed no charge at all.  
And howsoever he disguise the matter,  
To publish the first Part, he writ the latter.  
He that but strictly marks the whole Design,  
May trace the Prefacer in every Line;  
And tho' he did not own the wanton Ape,  
He nurs'd the Cub, and lick'd it into shape.  
And, Ladies, now without the help of Day,  
You may discern who does the Weapon sway  
And brandishes his Pen against your Credit;  
'Tis Mr. Eat-finger himself that did it.  
He that sits silent in his Wits' Defence,

<sup>1</sup> William Walsh, *Letters and Poems, amorous and gallant* (London, 1692). Walsh published the lampoon with a mock-panegyric letter. Extracts from a slightly differing version of the lampoon, in manuscript in the Folger Shakespeare Library, are quoted by Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 158.

Whose Mouth is fill'd with Fist instead of Sense;  
 Or else he crams his Hand into his Jaws  
 Like Russian Bears that live upon their Paws.  
 At Coffee-house among the Men of Worth,  
 He goggles like a Quaker holding forth.  
 Like an Endymion he can court the Moon,  
 And bark at her bright glories when h'as done.  
 Or like the Mouse in Fables he can plead,  
 He has deserv'd t'aspire to Princess' Bed,  
 Till for his daring Arrogance he's spurn'd,  
 And all his Fop-pretentions over-turn'd;  
 Then like the little Vermin squeaks and dies,  
 Or prints a Book of Ladies Cruelties.  
 This is the Fool, fair Ladies, that does haunt you,  
 That will from Dressing-room or Play gallant you.  
 W — he is called, what Name so much renown'd,  
 Through all the Realms of Nonsense can be found?

Of these verses Walsh remarked, that although their author had 'maliciously insinuated, that Mr. Dryden writes for me, and that I am covetous of M[y] L[ady] D[orchester]'s Company, yet I must do him the justice to declare I do not in the least believe Mr. Dryden had any hand in his Works, or that he ever found any great Satisfaction in the Conversation of M[y] L[ady] D[orchester]'.<sup>1</sup> From this remark and from the reference in Walsh's letter to Dryden ('they had brought in you & my Lady Dorchester by ye by as Friends of mine') it may be assumed that the author of the lampoon intended, for his own reasons, to suggest an association between Walsh and Lady Dorchester and not, as might have been expected, between Walsh and Lady Kingston. Although there is in the lampoon no reference to any woman by name, it is possible that such images as the Moon courted by Endymion or the Mouse and the Princess were intended to suggest to the initiate some connexion with Lady Dorchester. More light is thrown on this point by a manuscript letter dated 25 July 1691 from Walsh to the friend who had sent him the copy of verses.

Now to tell you ye truth Madam [Walsh wrote] I cannot imagine but this was written by some Rival [of] mine. Methinks it savours much of Mr. T—, & hee corrected by my Ld. K: [i.e. Lady Kingston]. Certainly they had some hand in it, or else shee woud rather have been put in y<sup>n</sup> my Ld. D: [i.e. Lady Dorchester]. However ye business is: I think my self extremely obliged to him for favouring [mee] with Mr. Dryden's style & my Ld. D: [s] conversation. If hee takes y<sup>t</sup> for an affront I dare answer for him, y<sup>t</sup> his Verses were never corrected by Mr. Dryden, nor his Company very agreeable to my Ld. D.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> William Walsh, op. cit.

<sup>2</sup> B.M. Add. MS. 10434, f. 53<sup>r</sup>. This passage, of which the rough draft in the manuscript

The rest of the story of Walsh's loves and enmities and literary revenges belongs to the biography of Walsh and not to an account of the relationship between Walsh and Dryden. That the intimacy between them continued to grow until the end of Dryden's life is shown by contemporary references and by the tone of Dryden's later letters to Walsh; but of the bulk of the doubtless considerable correspondence between them nothing, so far as is known, remains. It is unfortunate that circumstances should have been so unfavourable to the preservation of Walsh's papers after his death since, as the intimate friend of many of the great writers of his day, and, particularly, of Dryden, Addison, and Pope, he must have received many letters of great interest to posterity. But Walsh died unmarried as the last male of his line and, later, his home at Abberley was burnt to the ground, so that only a few papers have survived.<sup>1</sup> Dryden's letters to Walsh are among the most personal and interesting that he ever wrote and the eight recently recovered letters from Walsh fill in some of the gaps in their correspondence and in the known circumstances of their friendship. Now to the incomplete picture of Dryden, in the last decade of his life, encouraging a young writer of only moderate talent are added some details of the other side—Walsh's love and admiration of Dryden, the engaging confidence in Dryden's reciprocal interest which emboldened him to draw the reserved elderly man into his intimate hopes and plans, and something of that keen critical ability which had led Dryden to name him, with more than the mere hyperbole of affection, 'without flattery the best critic of our nation'.<sup>2</sup>

is hastily written with many crossings-out and corrections, caused some confusion for Professor Osborn, who quotes it in his book. Walsh's use of initials and abbreviations led Professor Osborn, in his guesses at the identity of the persons involved, to confuse not only their names but their sex. For instance, he quotes the second sentence as: 'Methinks it savours much of Mr. T. Shee corrected by my Lord R: . . .' and comments 'It would be tempting to guess . . . that "Mr. T. Shee" refers to Shadwell'. In fact the words are not 'Mr. T. Shee' but 'Mr. T—, & hee'. Similarly, the abbreviation transcribed by Professor Osborn as 'my Lord R:' is actually written as 'my Ld. K:' and refers to Lady Kingston, since 'Ld.' was Walsh's customary abbreviation for both 'Lord' and 'Lady'.

<sup>1</sup> How the Bodleian MS., now known as MS. Malone 9, came into Malone's possession is suggested in a letter from Bishop Percy to Malone, dated 21 April 1805 (Percy MS., Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington). 'Was it the late Mr. Bromley or the present Col. Bromley to whom he left his Estate that gave you Dryden's Letters to Walsh; and if I understand you rightly Walsh's commonplace Book? It must be very curious. My family by a female line was related to Walsh, whose sister (I believe) was the grandmother of Mr. Bromley.' MS. Malone 9 was probably also the MS. which Dr. Nash intended to publish since, if he and Malone had known of B.M. Add. MS. 10434, it is unlikely that the seven letters to Dryden contained in it would have remained unpublished. John Chambers (*Biographical Illustrations of Worcestershire* [Worcester, 1820], p. 322) says: 'I have seen a note written by Dr. Nash, requesting materials of Mr. Malone for a life of Walsh, which the Dr. meant to affix to a MS. of Walsh's intended for publication. On this note Mr. Malone had written that Dr. Nash did not fulfil his intentions.—Query—What were the contents of the MS. and in whose possession is it at present?'

<sup>2</sup> Dryden, 'Postscript to Virgil'.

## 'THE FRIEND OF MANKIND' (1700-60)—AN ASPECT OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY SENSIBILITY

By A. R. HUMPHREYS

*How much more glorious a character is that of the friend of mankind than that of the conqueror of nations!*

(Sir Charles Grandison, Letter XCVII.)

CATCHWORDS are not the worst of clues to the character of an age. They may not tell the whole story, but they point out those elements in it which caught the mood of the time. The clue of 'Nature', the most important of all in the eighteenth century, has been followed up in its fruitful multiplicity by Professor Willey.<sup>1</sup> Of other clues, such heady slogans as 'Friend of Mankind', 'Man of Feeling', and what Sir John Hawkins complained of as 'that cant phrase "Good Nature"', are not the least instructive. The 'Friend of Mankind' was a favourite of the eighteenth century, from his embodiment as 'Christian Hero' at its opening to that as radical 'Friend of Humanity' at its close. Humane, charitable, opening at a hint the sacred source of sympathetic tears, he enlivens many a chapter of the century's literature, and inspires that glow of benign sentiment which warms the pages of sensibility. He can, with Pope,

Grasp the whole worlds of reason, life, and sense,  
In one close system of benevolence,<sup>2</sup>

and he professes himself, like the Vicar of Wakefield, 'by nature an admirer of happy human faces'.

For the century was trying hard, and worthily, to account for its social impulses. Commerce was multiplying the transactions between men, and stressing themes of profit and loss. Moral philosophy, affected by the spirit of the time, was substituting for the passionate conflicts of the seventeenth century, which raged from Hell to Heaven and through the human soul, agreeable mundane arguments as to why man lives in society, whether self-love and social can be the same, whether the 'natural' impulses are co-operative, and whether society originates in fear or trust. Men were seeking a credible, and creditable, social psychology: they were founding morality, as Christians, on love of God, and Christian charity towards men; as 'intellectualists', on universal moral law to which man

<sup>1</sup> B. Willey, *The Eighteenth Century Background* (London, 1940).

<sup>2</sup> Pope, *Essay on Man*, iv. 357.

conforms through reason; as believers in 'moral sentiment', on the affections and passions of the heart. From all this there gradually arises a composite portrait of what the age, at its best, desired itself to be. In this paper the stress will be mainly on the third of these categories, for it was the vogue of 'moral sentiment' which most affected literature as the century progressed.

When Rousseau affirmed that no one could take a lively interest in *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, 'sans avoir ce sixième sens, ce sens moral',<sup>1</sup> he was echoing Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, who followed on the Cambridge Platonists and the Latitudinarian divines, and in turn led to Hume, Hartley, and Adam Smith. Under the influence of them all, the great and majestic change came about, from dominant reason to dominant feeling. The materialistic psychology of Hobbes, the rational cogitative psychology of Locke, and that 'faction and mistaken zeal' which Whichcote condemned, yielded before expansive accounts of human behaviour as arising from man's sentiments and affections. The universality of human reason was mellowed and extended by a like universality of feeling until, by general consent, reason (though still esteemed) was relegated to a subordinate role. The persistent effort of eighteenth-century moral discussion was to provide the 'friends of mankind' with a basis of theory, to establish a reading of human nature in terms of generous emotion, and thereby to change the climate of the age from one cooled by the breezes of intellect to one warmed by the zephyrs of sentiment.

Such inquiry into the springs of human action involves the most delicate problems. This paper cannot pretend to say what are the 'right' answers to the questions which eighteenth-century thinkers raised. It can only touch on the way in which they raised them, and the effects their answers had on the literary outlook of the time. They spoke not as specialists, but as reasonable men talking to their fellows, and their discussions have a social tone, a sensible and mellow humanity, which accords well with the agreeable worldly faces which look down from the walls of the National Portrait Gallery. It is true that Swift spoke sarcastically of an attitude which took to be true 'nothing which cannot be presently comprehended by the weakest noddle'. But it was the measure of the eighteenth-century faith in man that the majority of noddles (within, it must be conceded, the circles of literacy) were supposed capable of comprehending, without much strain, the arguments which philosophers drew from their experience as sensible, sociable men.

These arguments revolved round the social capacities of man, and in particular round themes of benevolence and sympathy. Such themes were not new: Christianity itself is founded in the universality of love, all being

<sup>1</sup> J.-J. Rousseau, *Confessions* (Paris, 1826), iii. 102.



members of one body in Christ. What was new was the founding of such benevolence in the nature of man as man. Clarke, the intellectualist, founded it on the intellectual perception of equality and similarity between men as rational creatures. Believers in 'moral sentiment' founded it on man's spontaneous affections, and they were led to investigate senses and intuitions of an ever subtler kind, through an extended introspection. The importance of the 'moral sentiment' school lies in its enthusiastic belief in the holiness of the heart's affections, its trust in feeling as the evaluator of virtue, and its sensitiveness to the delicate and irrational intuitions by which man is prompted.

In initiating the new impulse, as in other expressions of sweetness and light, the Cambridge Platonists were influential. Whether or not the 'moral sense' of eighteenth-century ethics goes back to Henry More's 'boniform faculty' which appreciates the 'savour and sweetness' of goodness, there is no dispute that the Cambridge school spoke for reasonableness and humanity. 'Universal charity is a thing final in religion' wrote Whichcote. He recommended a temperament of 'serenity and calmness and clear apprehension, fair weather within'; he spoke of vice as 'contrary to the nature of man as man', of virtue as being to the mind like health to the body, of the good man as 'an Instrument in Tune'. In More's words, we 'relish and savour what is absolutely best and rejoice in it'; the best beliefs come to 'the noblest and most generous spirit'. The Cambridge Platonists praised reason, but in doing so they transcended it and rose into a noble spirituality. It is in the warmth of feeling with which they pleaded for human kindness (and, incidentally, humankind-ness), in the approach to God through sympathy with men, that there lies the refutation of seventeenth-century fanaticism and the basis of the eighteenth-century's social gospel.

The earliest work to have the typically eighteenth-century flavour, to present happiness (rather than salvation) as our being's end and aim, was perhaps Richard Cumberland's *De Legibus Naturae Disquisitio Philosophica* (1672), translated by John Maxwell in 1727. Though Cumberland was a bishop, and none of the Platonists more than master of a college, his work (though not his life) was less religious than theirs. He was writing in reply to Hobbes, and his aim was to justify the ways of man to man. So his argument was secular and social, and he foreshadowed the rise of utilitarianism. Man's helplessness as a child, his psychological needs as an adult, his ability to communicate his thoughts and feelings—these things imply a social setting and a co-operative disposition. We first learn lessons of benevolence through realizing that our physical desires are limited, and that we cannot possibly monopolize the earth's goods. But we soon find nobler motives, too. There is a natural attraction between creatures of the

same species, and 'a known likeness of Nature . . . does somewhat promote Benevolence'.<sup>1</sup> Self-love thus leads naturally to social. Friendship among men, Cumberland observes, is so natural that only disease or perversion can inspire us with enmity towards others. He argues from postulates which, compared with the spiritual aphorisms of Whichcote, suffer from the cut-and-dried manner of the moral syllogism. They do, however, methodically consider the good of society as a whole, casting on their subject that dry light of reason which preceded the glow of sentiment. These postulates are: 'that the greatest Happiness they can attain is sought by Men', 'that they can exercise love not only towards themselves but towards God and Men partaking of that same rational nature with themselves', and 'that the same Experience which proves that the Benevolence of each towards all is the most effectual cause of the Happiness of the Benevolent, does most necessarily prove . . . that the Love of any Number towards any Number has an effect in proportion'.<sup>2</sup> This sort of argument lies dustily upon the tongue, but it suggests how secular, how mathematical, moral philosophy was to become. Cumberland is greatly concerned with 'the Publick Natural Good', which, for created beings, is 'that which renders them more perfect and happy'.<sup>3</sup> He was born, and (broadly speaking) wrote, half a generation later than the Cambridge Platonists, and his utilitarian flavour is a sign of the times. Men singly and collectively seek happiness: acts which promote public happiness are those which best promote private happiness too. Man is a social animal, and benevolence his moral law—that is the essence of Cumberland's work.

The last decade of the seventeenth century produced a crop of hortatory pamphlets, which explore the nature of man and of moral conduct.<sup>4</sup> Besides these, Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, though dealing primarily with problems of knowledge, turns for a while to moral questions, to insist that we are motivated only by pleasure and pain, that what we call 'good' and 'evil' are those things which produce pleasure and pain, and that man's individual and social aim is happiness. Virtue is commended for its tendency to public good, God having joined the two together 'by an inseparable connection', so that virtue is 'visibly beneficial to all with whom the virtuous man has to do'.<sup>5</sup> Tillotson, Barrow, and Sherlock recommend the social virtues from the pulpit, Barrow in particular insisting on an innate generosity and sociability 'which disposeth men to serve the

<sup>1</sup> Cumberland, *A Treatise of the Laws of Nature* (London, 1727), pt. i. 125.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 56-7.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>4</sup> Rae Blanchard's edition of Steele's *Christian Hero* (O.U.P., 1932) has an illuminating account of these, and of the stoic-antistoic dispute they were mostly engaged in concerning reason and passion.

<sup>5</sup> Locke, *op. cit.* bk. i, ch. 1, sect. 6.

public and promote the benefit of society',<sup>1</sup> and linking the social virtues with 'Nature' which, 'by implanting in our constitution a love for society and aversion from solitude . . . dictate[s] unto us that our good is inseparably connected and complicated with the good of others'.<sup>2</sup> He earned the praise of Shaftesbury, and indeed his warm recommendations of the benevolent virtues make him an influential progenitor of the Friends of Mankind. The eighteenth century opened, therefore, with its principal moral topics prominent, if not clearly defined, and a marked shift towards an optimistic and utilitarian humanism.

The Shaftesbury who was a pupil of Locke, admirer of the Latitudinarians, and editor of Whichcote's *Sermons* (1698) was, it is hardly necessary to remark, the Friend of Mankind in his most refined, most patrician form. Professor Willey has discussed him more luminously in one chapter of *The Eighteenth Century Background* than anyone else in a complete book, and it is therefore the less needful here to attempt to amplify what could not be improved upon. But a brief sketch seems unavoidable of one who belongs so quintessentially to the subject, who was conscious of himself as the philosopher of philanthropy, was recognized as such by others, and inspired a remarkable bulk of well-meaning writing on humanitarian themes.<sup>3</sup> He satisfied a psychological and aesthetic hunger which, it is probable, England had felt since the days of Hobbes and of Puritanism. Against Hobbist and Puritan combativeness he raised the banner of generous and expansive humanity, and took for his ally the power of ridicule. It is true that not all his readers were as prepared as he to entrust the latter with such important functions.

Lo, Shaftesbury rears her high on Reason's throne,  
And loads the slave with honours not her own,

John Brown commented and (turning ridicule against ridicule herself) he continued with a gibe against the Minute Philosophers:

Truth in her gloomy cave why do we seek?  
Lo, gay she sits in Laughter's dimpled cheek:  
Contemns each surly academic foe,  
And courts the spruce Freethinker, and the Beau.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Barrow, *Works* (3rd ed. London, 1716), iii. 245, Sermon xxx. Cf. i. Sermons xxv-xxx; also Tillotson, *Works* (London, 1820), Sermons xx, xxxvi, cxlii, and Sherlock, *Nature and Measure of Charity* (London, 1697).

<sup>2</sup> Barrow, op. cit. iii. 245. Cf. too i. Sermon xxvi—"The practice of benignity, of courtesy and of clemency, at first sight, without any discursive reflection, doth obtain approbation and applause from us: being no less grateful and amiable to the mind than fragrance to our smell and sweetness to our palate", &c.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C. A. Moore, 'Shaftesbury and the Ethical Poets in England, 1700-1760', *P.M.L.A.* xxxi (1916).

<sup>4</sup> Brown, *An Essay On Satire, Occasioned by the Death of Mr. Pope* (1745), part ii, 199-200, 209-12.

Coxcombs might henceforth vanquish Berkeley with a grin, under the impression that this was an approved mode of philosophic argument. But that was of less consequence than the fact that a full flood of Greek thought, more potent than that Christianized by the Cambridge Platonists, poured into English ethics, in a style nicely tempered of cool reason and warm emotion, popularizing moral taste as an impulse to benevolence. J. M. Robertson, in his introduction to the *Characteristics*, traces in Shaftesbury's first work, the *Inquiry concerning Virtue* (1699), a debt to Spinoza which Shaftesbury may have incurred during his visit to Holland in 1698. Implicit or explicit in Spinoza's letters and *Ethics* are the beliefs that apparent sin and evil are not real, and are to be borne patiently as the products of inevitable necessary laws; that acts done from fear of punishment are not virtuous; and that benevolence brings happiness. Such, in skeleton form, is Shaftesbury's thought too, supplemented by his famous assimilation of moral and aesthetic approval, his belief in the beneficent purposes of 'Nature', and his trust in human impulse as leading to good. *Cogito ergo sum* gives way in him to an assurance based on the realities of feeling and passion. 'We cannot doubt of what passes within ourselves. Our passions and affections are known to us. They are certain, whatever the objects may be on which they are employed.'<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth could not have spoken more clearly. These passions and affections are generous and social. The constitution of human nature, antecedent to reasoning and the calculation of advantages, tends towards the sympathetic virtues, expanding outward from the family by wider and wider circles throughout humanity.<sup>2</sup> As Pope was to put it,

Self-love but serves the virtuous mind to wake,  
As the small pebble stirs the peaceful lake.  
The centre moved, a circle strait succeeds,  
Another still, and still another spreads:  
Friend, parent, neighbour, first it will embrace,  
His country next, and next all human race:  
Wide and more wide, th' o'erflowings of the mind  
Take ev'ry creature in, of ev'ry kind.<sup>3</sup>

It is in the exercise of these special virtues that man achieves his true nature and fulfils the law of his being.

Shaftesbury did not originate the argument that man's social affections are natural, or that self-love and social are, properly speaking, harmonious; but in basing his system on this, in analysing the springs of impulse in particular detail to show them to be sociable, and in so confidently pro-

<sup>1</sup> Shaftesbury, *Inquiry Concerning Virtue*, bk. ii, pt. 2, *ad fin.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *Freedom of Wit and Humour*, pt. 3, para. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Pope, *Essay on Man*, iv. 363.

claiming virtue to consist in promoting the good and happiness of others, he brought it about that English ethics largely abandoned argument from abstract rational principles, in favour of the introspective study of the mind, and that benevolence based itself on the heart rather than the head.

Such a statement adds nothing to what all commentators on Shaftesbury have observed. His pages are studded with remarks which offer themselves for quotation, were any substantiation of this brief account needed. His work was not rendered any the less influential by its repetitions and lack of system. A philosopher with less of the virtuoso would doubtless have guarded against inconsistencies and redundancies, and would probably not have worn his heart so boldly on his sleeve. But Shaftesbury gave his time what it wanted, and what was good for it. His was an indispensable voice in that indispensable age, and the frequency with which echoes of it are heard throughout the century, even if distorted or fragmentary, testifies to its extraordinary effect.

The effect was due, no doubt, to the fact that he was ahead of his time only in the confidence with which he articulated what many were feeling. The current which bore him along merely swept him a little farther, a little faster, than his contemporaries. Richard Steele felt it, for example, when he wrote *The Christian Hero* (1701) at a time when nothing of Shaftesbury's had appeared except the *Inquiry concerning Virtue*. Steele appeals to the compassionate and Christian virtues as against the restrictive and stoic ones. God 'presses us by Natural Society to a close Union with each other, which is methinks a sort of enlargement of our very selves, when we run into the Ideas, Sensations, and Concerns of our Brethren'.<sup>1</sup> The credit of formulating such an 'enlargement' of the self through 'running into' the concerns of others has been given to later writers, to Hutcheson, to Hume, and to Adam Smith. It is not, of course, a startling or unexpected notion, and it is implicit or explicit in many systems of morality. But it was due for distinguished emphasis in the eighteenth century, and its appearance in *The Christian Hero* is interesting enough. *The Tatler*, *The Spectator*, *The Guardian*, and their successors propagated the new spirit, to be followed, when the influence of Shaftesbury had taken full effect, by those 'overflowing feelings of a tender compassionate heart' which Thomas Murdock signaled in his 1740 preface to Thomson's poems. For Thomson is the most distinguished poetic disciple of Shaftesbury, whose name he joins with those of Bacon, Boyle, Newton, and Locke as his favourite philosophers; he praises 'the inward rapture, only to be felt', inspired by true benevolence (*Summer*, l. 1646), and, in *Spring* (cf. ll. 556 ff. 'Hail, Source of Being! Universal Soul Of heaven and earth!') he follows Theocles' famous Nature rhapsody in *The Moralists*.

<sup>1</sup> Steele, *op. cit.*, p. 81.



As, however, the features of the Friend of Mankind were thus composing themselves into expressions of laudable and sociable benignity, they were for a while disarranged by the paradoxes of Mandeville, the sharpness of whose sardonic wit and alert masculine style is not unlike that of Mr. Bernard Shaw. His *Grumbling Hive* (1705) was expanded as *The Fable of the Bees* (1714), but he took little notice of Shaftesbury's optimism until the edition of 1723, in which he observed that 'two Systems cannot be more opposite than his Lordship's and mine'.<sup>1</sup> A sharp difference from Shaftesbury arose from Mandeville's Manichaeic view of 'Nature' as being both kind and cruel, two opposites which no scheme of cosmic harmony will reconcile.<sup>2</sup> A second difference arose from Mandeville's restricting the qualification of 'virtuous' to those acts alone which are done 'contrary to the impulse of Nature'<sup>3</sup> and by an exercise of self-denial. He thus reminded men once again of the contrast between the asceticism of traditional moral thinking (particularly of revealed religion) and the indulgence of the new, 'natural', morality. That Christian morals and 'natural' human impulses do not go hand-in-hand was not, of course, news to orthodox Christian thinkers, and it explains Henry Crabb Robinson's remark that the Church, while disapproving of Mandeville, felt a covert satisfaction at the concern he caused the optimists.<sup>4</sup> And a third difference from Shaftesbury arose from differing views on social feelings. For Shaftesbury it was certain naturally amiable qualities which make man a social being, social not only for material advantages, but for the satisfaction of impulses of sympathy. For Mandeville, social feelings were a product of, not an impulse towards, social organization—'Men become sociable by living in society'. It is economic motives (which in conventional moral terms we think of as sordid, and perhaps evil), which bring men together, and it is in the satisfaction of economic demands that the prosperity exists of that society which we like to think of as built on humanistic foundations.

This opposition of views is by no means dead: broadly speaking, its contemporary form is the conflict between the 'idealistic' conception of social relations held by the beneficiaries, and the 'materialistic' conception held by the victims, of the modern economic machine. Shaftesbury's view of human nature was encouraging and benign, and, despite some opposition, aroused widespread enthusiasm. Mandeville's was discouraging and

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., ed. F. B. Kaye (Oxford, 1924), i. 324.

<sup>2</sup> On this cf. *Free Thoughts on Religion* (London, 1720), p. 105; and Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1876), ii. 39-40.

<sup>3</sup> Mandeville, *Fable of the Bees* (ed. cit.), i. 48.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Shaftesbury's *Characteristics* (ed. J. M. Robertson, 1900), i. xl: reference is there made to a letter from Henry Crabb Robinson to Schlosser which speaks of a 'sneaking kindness' felt by Churchmen for Mandeville because of his hostility to optimistic pantheism.



sardonic, and aroused widespread dismay.<sup>1</sup> By its very irritant qualities, however, it stirred the optimists to greater vehemence, as antipathy to Hobbes had stirred his opponents, and though modern scholarship gives him high credit for his sociological realism he remains in his own time a lonely counterpoise to the general belief in benevolence.

The Friends of Mankind achieve their greatest distinction, after Shaftesbury, in the work of Hutcheson, Hartley, Hume, and Adam Smith, and it is with these writers that the tone of eighteenth-century social philosophy becomes most characteristic. The intellectual climate becomes milder and sunnier; literature glows with moral sentiment; the sharpness of satire and the chill of sovereign reason yield before the claims of feeling, as the gardens of country gentlemen forsake their geometrical figures and soften into the outlines of natural grace. Of this process no book could be more representative than Hutcheson's *Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, which comprises two treatises, 'Concerning Beauty, Order, Harmony, Design', and 'Concerning Moral Good and Evil'. It appeared in 1725, and from that time onwards much is to be heard of a faculty that 'may be call'd a Moral Sense'<sup>2</sup> (a term which Shaftesbury had used only infrequently). Why are we concerned about others, even in remote lands or times? Why do we esteem virtue rather than success? Why do we prefer loss with honour to gain with dishonour? The 'moral sense', or, more characteristically, 'moral sentiment', like Shaftesbury's 'taste', must exist to prompt us in these and all similar cases, by an immediate intuition quite apart from calculations of advantage direct or indirect, earthly or divine.

The 'moral sense' or 'sentiment' does not really belong to the theme of this paper. One could be benevolent, and beneficent, while still rejecting it. The 'intellectualist' school grounded itself austere on rational judgement of moral action rather than on intuition, yet even on this ground Clarke could declare that 'every rational creature ought to do all the good it can to its fellow-creatures'; and behind the revolutionary 'Friends of Humanity' there stood Godwin with the categorical imperatives of a rigid and purely intellectual morality. The significance of the 'moral sense' is in the larger part it allowed for the play of the intuitive, for the indulgence of immediate responses of fellowship and sympathy, to which abstract reasonableness did not lend itself. It broadens us on the perceptive side, as benevolence on the active. It is antecedent to (though strengthened by) reason—if we did not spontaneously feel for the good of others, no rational

<sup>1</sup> C. A. Moore, *op. cit.*, cites replies by Dennis, *Vice and Luxury Public Mischiefs* (1724); Law, *Remarks on the Fable of the Bees* (1724); Fiddes, *General Treatise of Morality* (1724); Hutcheson, *Essays* (1725); Gay, *Degenerate Bees* (1727); Berkeley, *Alciphron* (1732); Bramston, *Man of Taste* (1733); Brown, *Honour, a Poem* (1743) and *Essays on the Characteristics* (1751); Mallet, 'Tyburn' (1762) &c.

<sup>2</sup> Hutcheson, *Concerning Moral Good and Evil* (5th ed., 1753), p. 113.

argument could evoke such a feeling, even though we might perceive advantages in having it. Hutcheson hereby advances that development (shortly to be epitomized in epigram by Pope, and consummated by Hume) by which reason, 'Form'd but to check, delib'rate, and advise', is recognized as judge merely of 'subordinate ends' but not of ultimates, about which 'there is no judging'.<sup>1</sup> Room is thus made in the forefront of men's attention for the recognition of many subtle, instinctive, and 'unaccountable' qualities of mind and feeling. Hutcheson increases the 'senses' far beyond the arbitrary five of physical sensation, to include 'Imagination', 'the pleasant perceptions arising from regular, harmonious, and uniform objects', Public Sense or Sympathy, the Moral Sense, and a Sense of Honour.<sup>2</sup> Writing in 1897, L. A. Selby-Bigge described the eighteenth-century philosophers of moral sentiment as, to all appearances, lacking in influence in the nineteenth century, but he surmised that if social psychology studied its history, they would be found to be nearer the main stream of speculation than is commonly supposed.<sup>3</sup> Certainly the more the change in eighteenth-century tone is examined the more important they appear, not perhaps as originating it but as making it a matter of conscious and intent speculation. Discussing 'what thin partitions sense from thought divide', they may not have arrived at conclusions which impress the specialist, but their influence on literary development it would be hard to overrate. Hutcheson, extending sense perception to include 'every determination of our minds to receive ideas independently of our Will', and Hume arguing that 'the ultimate ends of human actions can never . . . be accounted for by reason, but recommend themselves entirely to the sentiments and affections of mankind',<sup>4</sup> mark the crucial change of emphasis. The Friend of Mankind could echo Mr. Timothy Twitch—'I love to see a gentleman with a tender heart'<sup>5</sup>—and tender hearts came in the same category as the senses, intuitions, and instincts.

They were also fortified by association. John Gay<sup>6</sup> and David Hartley were the cultivators of this most fruitful principle. Arguing that the disputes over morality are merely verbal, Gay takes elements from all schools as he finds them, but his conclusion is utilitarian, grounded in religion but directed not primarily to salvation but to happiness in this world. For this happiness the Will of God is the authority. God himself

<sup>1</sup> Hutcheson, *System of Moral Philosophy* (1755), i. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Kames's *Principles of Morality* (1751) even found room for a Sense of Property, cf. Selby-Bigge, *British Moralists* (Oxford, 1897), para. 948.

<sup>3</sup> Selby-Bigge, *British Moralists*, p. lxx.

<sup>4</sup> Hume, *Enquiries concerning the Human Understanding and concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. Selby-Bigge (Oxford, 1902), p. 293 (Appendix I, sect. v).

<sup>5</sup> Goldsmith, *The Good-Natured Man*, III.

<sup>6</sup> J. Gay, *Dissertation concerning the Fundamental Principle of Virtue*, prefixed to Law's translation (1731) of King's *Origin of Evil*.

lives in eternal happiness, and by manifesting his goodness in his works proves that his design in creating them is their happiness, 'and therefore wills their Happiness, therefore the means of their Happiness: therefore that my Behaviour as far as it may be a means of the Happiness of Mankind should be such'.<sup>1</sup> It is an argument which Addison had put ringingly into the mouth of Cato:<sup>2</sup>

If there's a power above us  
(And that there is all Nature cries aloud  
Through all her works) he must delight in virtue,  
And that which he delights in must be happy—

though whereas to the Stoic virtue is happiness, to Gay happiness is virtue. He speaks approvingly of Hutcheson, but considers that (unless further explained) the 'moral sense' and 'benevolent affection' are, if not suspiciously 'akin to the doctrine of innate ideas', yet too similar to that of 'occult qualities'. To explain them, therefore, by careful and systematic analysis, he derives all our modes of approbation from the great original desire for happiness, by association conscious or unconscious. Our apparently spontaneous approval of certain kinds of actions does not, he argues, prove that we 'naturally' have a 'moral sense', but that we have so long associated such actions with beneficial results that we approve them automatically. Yet the fact that we acquire, rather than have innately, such habits of approbation does not mean that they are the less genuine: the soul's calm sunshine and the heartfelt joy which good actions occasion are as real as in any other school of thought. Such, in brief, is the grand principle of association.

It was Hartley's *Observations of Man* (1749) that gave associationism its full amplitude. For Hartley, as for Gay, and for Priestley who edited him for popular reading in 1775, the 'moral sense' is acquired, not original—compounded of childhood discipline, experience of the world's rewards and punishments, religious hopes and fears, love of God as the origin of all virtues, and so on. Though acquired, it comes to act automatically: through social training, we enjoy more pleasure from self-sacrifice, for example, than we lose, yet we sacrifice ourselves not to gain such pleasure but because we have been led to recognize such action as 'good' and 'right'. This Hartley takes to be 'a proof from the doctrine of association that there is and must be such a thing as pure disinterested benevolence'<sup>3</sup>—'when circumstances conduce to it' one might add, for associationism is deterministic, and different surroundings would produce different moral qualities,

<sup>1</sup> Gay, op. cit., p. xxx.

<sup>2</sup> *Cato*, v. ii. 15-18.

<sup>3</sup> Hartley, op. cit. (5th ed., Bath, 1810), i. 487 (pt. i, ch. iv, sect. iv—'Of the Pleasures and Pains of Sympathy').

a fact which Priestley realized in his introduction in accounting for the 'prodigious variety in the sentiments of mankind'.<sup>1</sup> The circumstances in which Gay and Hartley wrote, however, the small and safe society of the eighteenth century, certainly might conduce to benevolence through association, and, in so limited and assuring a context, philanthropy could find momentous support in the new and pregnant psychological principle.

It is with Hume and Adam Smith that we approach the realm of the most expansive good nature. We may think once more of their distinguished contemporary, Mr. Timothy Twitch: 'Humanity, Sir, is a jewel. It's better than gold. I love humanity.' As with Shaftesbury and Hutcheson, so with Hume and Adam Smith—the *tone* of their writing is as important as its sense. Virtue, fixed as in a frost by the intellectualists, is to be thawed out: the springs of human nature are to be freed from the clear but icy crust of reason, and are to flow and bubble from their inmost sources. Vice, says Hume (and the argument applies to virtue, too), 'is no particular fact or relation which can be the object of understanding';<sup>2</sup> virtue is moral action which evokes 'the pleasing sentiment of approbation', and vice the contrary.<sup>3</sup> Reason will not reveal them to us, but the constitution of our human nature does so—like secondary qualities (colour, sound, and so on) in physics, their reality is subjective and not objective. Nor can reason and 'abstruse calculations' impel us to action: the passions, spontaneous and non-rational, must do that. As Pope had expressed it,

On life's vast ocean diversely we sail,  
Reason the card, but passion is the gale.<sup>4</sup>

There was, of course, little novelty in that. The novelty lies in the degree of fervour, the effusion of sensibility, which affects Hume's pen (and Adam Smith's) on such topics. The 'sentiments of humanity', declares Hume, are so engaging that they 'brighten up the very face of sorrow and operate like the sun, which shining on a dusky cloud or falling rain paints on them the most glorious colours which are to be found in the whole circle of nature'.<sup>5</sup> Such enthusiasm over sorrow and sympathy is what distinguishes the later part of the century. Hutcheson had already imagined a benevolence coextensive with humanity and even, almost, with astral space—if, he said, we knew of any rational and moral beings 'in the most distant planets', we should wish them well and 'desire their happiness'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Priestley, *Hartley's Theory of the Human Mind on the Principle of the Association of Ideas* (London, 1775), p. xliii.

<sup>2</sup> Hume, *Enquiries concerning the Human Understanding and concerning the Principles of Morals*, ed. Selby-Bigge (1902), p. 292 (Appendix I, sect. iii).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 289.

<sup>4</sup> *Essay on Man*, ii. 107 f.

<sup>5</sup> Hume, *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. Green and Grose (London, 1875), Essay XVI, 'The Stoic', i. 208.

<sup>6</sup> Hutcheson, *Concerning Moral Good and Evil* (ed. cit.), p. 165.

For Hume, benevolence was almost as far-reaching—"Toils, dangers, death itself, carry their charms, when we brave them for the public good".<sup>1</sup> Such devotion is quite disinterested, springing not (as with Gay and Hartley) from social conditioning but from the original 'structure of human nature'. A man grieving for a dead friend, who had drawn upon his help and charity—how can we suppose his passionate sorrow arises from any regard to self-interest? Do we not desire a friend's welfare, even though our absence or death should deprive us of participation in it?<sup>2</sup> Such questions answer themselves. Far from being narrowly self-regarding, we seek our pleasure in a wide, benevolent sympathy. Even this way of expressing it has, perhaps, too hedonistic a sound, for the virtuous man, while enjoying the praise and pleasure which good actions occasion, acts not to obtain them but to obey the promptings of his nature. Hume's *Treatise* describes our social responsiveness as being analogous to the sympathetically vibrating strings of violins.<sup>3</sup> The *Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* carries this farther, into an active concern for the benefit of others. 'No qualities are more readily intitled to the general good-will and approbation of mankind than beneficence and humanity, friendship and gratitude, natural affection and public spirit . . . and a generous concern for our kind and species.'<sup>4</sup> So it is in the pages of *le bon David* that the Friend of Mankind finds his most enraptured delineator. 'The softest benevolence, the most undaunted resolution, the tenderest sentiments, the most sublime love of virtue, all these animate successively his transported bosom. What satisfaction when he looks within, to find the most turbulent passions tuned to just harmony and concord, and every jarring sound banished from this enchanting music!'<sup>5</sup>

With Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) we are still in the same intoxicating atmosphere—intoxicating not because we have taken leave of good sense, but because we indulge our feelings with the sense of inhibitions released. The centre of his system is sympathy; man is a social animal to the extent almost of finding in society a supra-personal self. We approve the impulses of others when we can 'go along with' them; we approve our own when we feel that an impartial spectator could 'go along with' us likewise. Thus moral approbation is derived not from a 'moral sense' which varies from man to man, but from a sympathetic enlargement of ourselves by which we identify ourselves with society at its best and highest.

Smith's panegyrics on sympathy, on 'the amiable virtue of humanity', as

<sup>1</sup> Hume, *Essays*, &c. (ed. cit.), i. 208.

<sup>2</sup> Hume, *Enquiries*, &c., (ed. cit.), pp. 299-300.

<sup>3</sup> Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. Selby-Bigge (Oxford, 1896), p. 576 (bk. iii, pt. iii, sect. 1).

<sup>4</sup> Hume, *Enquiries*, &c., (ed. cit.), p. 178.

<sup>5</sup> Hume, *Essays*, &c. i. 209.



Hume's on benevolence, recall the novels of sensibility. There are the same overflowings of generous emotion, the same warm charity, the same transports and tears. The victims of circumstances, we are informed, 'by relating their misfortunes . . . in some measure renew their grief. Their tears accordingly flow faster than before. . . . They take pleasure, however, in all this, and it is evident are sensibly relieved by it, because the sweetness of the bystander's sympathy more than compensates the bitterness of their sorrow'.<sup>1</sup> Pity for the suffering of another, Hobbes had said, is merely a form of self-concern—it arises from fear lest such suffering should befall oneself. Not so, replies Adam Smith; we sympathize not because we fear we might suffer what another suffers (a man sympathizes with a woman in childbirth), but because we project ourselves into the situation of another through an outgoing of personality. Many virtues arise from the efforts of sufferer and sympathizer to attune themselves to each other, the former moderating his anguish, the latter entering into his situation with all the delicacy of sensibility. As in Hume, these promptings of the moral nature, these sympathies and approbations, are the outcome not of reason, but of 'immediate sense and feeling'<sup>2</sup> by which we are attracted to virtue and repelled from vice by the very constitution of human nature. It is partly through the vogue of such a moral outlook that Fielding is able to write enthusiastically of the spread of charity—'this virtue hath shone brighter at our time than at any period which I remember in our annals'.<sup>3</sup> The contribution of £100,000 made by the British public to the victims of the Lisbon earthquake in 1755 seems particularly to have struck the imagination of the time. Smollett pointed out, as 'a circumstance which enhances the merit of this action' that 'though the English were themselves in great want of grain, a considerable part of that sum was sent in corn, flour, rice, and a large quantity of beef from Ireland'.<sup>4</sup> In less spectacular fashion the foundation of charity schools, the Royal Humane Society, dispensaries for the poor, and other philanthropic institutions, and the spread of the humanitarian novel, were signs of the times.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, bk. i, sect. i, ch. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pt. vii, sect. iii, ch. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Fielding, *The Champion*, 16 February 1740. Cf. also *The Covent Garden Journal*, no. 44, 2 June 1752: 'Charity is, in fact, the very characteristic of this Nation at this Time. I believe we may challenge the whole World to parallel the Examples which we have of late given of this sensible, this noble, this Christian virtue.'

<sup>4</sup> Smollett, *Continuation of the Complete History of England* (1760-1), i. 295. It was the fact that Englishmen combined to assist not their fellow countrymen or co-religionaries but those of a different nation and faith that was felt to be novel. [Cf. Westermarck, *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas* (2nd ed. London, 1912), i. 558.] Later in the century there may have been a feeling that generosity could go too far—Pigott's *Political Dictionary* (1795) defines Charity as 'enormous contributions for French rebels: an utter neglect of our own poor'.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. M. D. George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1925), *passim*.



That so much attention has been given here to the school of moral sentiment with its stress on subjectivism does not mean, of course, that there were not arguments on the other side claiming for morality external rather than internal authority. To orthodox Christians a discussion of moral impulses divorced from the sanctions of religion was the mere crackling of thorns under a pot. Dr. Johnson discounted universal benevolence because the affections, unless confined to private friendships, 'would vanish like elemental fire in boundless evaporation',<sup>1</sup> and he reminded the moral philosophers, in a great passage, how irrelevant were their disputes about motives: 'Of him that hopes to be forgiven, it is indispensibly required that he forgive. It is therefore superfluous to urge any other motive. On this great duty eternity is suspended, and to him that refuses to practise it, the throne of mercy is inaccessible, and the Saviour of the world has been born in vain.'<sup>2</sup> The intellectualists, as has been mentioned, grounded themselves on a supposed moral order objectively realized in the constitution of the universe to which man conforms through reason. And Jeremy Bentham was to erect the 'greatest happiness' principle, already sketched by Cumberland, Hutcheson, and Gay,<sup>3</sup> into an absolute and objective standard. By this great principle of 'utility' he claimed to unmask all those of a contrary opinion—pedlars of Moral Sense, Common Sense, Immutable Rule of Right, Law of Reason, Grace by Election, and all the other catchwords—as subjectivists, who had 'not known what they were meaning',<sup>4</sup> merely erecting into laws their personal impressions.

But however opposed to the enthusiasts for moral sentiment, all these added something to the detailed modelling of the features of the Friend of Mankind, for each shared the prevailing social mood of the time. In *The Covent Garden Journal* of 5 May 1752 Everybody writes to Nobody asserting that he, Everybody, is busy devising 'a vast number of schemes' for the poor. Johnson notes in *The Idler* of 6 May 1758 that 'no sooner is a new species of misery brought to view and a design of relieving it proposed, than every hand is open to contribute something, every tongue

The temptation to quote Parson Woodforde need not be resisted—'August 11 [1762]: 'Went this afternoon to Cary Church where Jerry Holton read prayers and preached for Mr. Penny. Holton preached concerning Private Interest giving way to Public Good in regard to our having a Water Engine to prevent Fire spreading.'

<sup>1</sup> Johnson, *The Rambler*, no. 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, no. 185.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Cumberland: 'The greatest benevolence of every rational agent towards all constitutes the happiest state of all in general and of each in particular . . . and therefore the common good of all is the supreme law' [*Treatise of the Laws of Nature* (London, 1727), ch. i, para. iv]. Hutcheson: 'That action is the best which procures the greatest Happiness for the greatest Numbers' (*Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue*, sect. iii, para. iii).

<sup>4</sup> Bentham, *Principles of Morals and Legislation* (printed 1780, published London, 1789), ch. ii, para. xiv.

is busied in solicitation, and every art of pleasure is employed for a time in the cause of virtue'.<sup>1</sup> Smollett, surveying the course of the same year (1758) in the *Continuation of the Complete History of England* (1760-1), asserts that 'the virtues of benevolence are always springing up to an extraordinary growth in the British soil' and points to 'the great number of hospitals and infirmaries in London and Westminster erected and maintained by voluntary contributions'.<sup>2</sup> Goldsmith's Chinese Sage, in *The Citizen of the World* (Letter XXIII), testifies to the 'exalted virtue' of the English in exercising their charity. At the same time paragons of virtue begin to parade in the pages of fiction: those amiable qualities which, says Adam Smith, 'consist in that degree of sensibility which surprises by its exquisite delicacy and tenderness', find themselves embodied, ever more surprisingly delicate and tender, in well-known figures like Sir Charles Grandison or Sir William Thornhill,<sup>3</sup> and less-known ones like that Sir George Ellison in Mrs. Sarah Scott's novel who, falling in love with a girl who loves another man but cannot marry for lack of money, bestows £2,000 and a trousseau on her so that she may espouse his rival, and then thanks Providence for delivering him from one for whom his love would have been so great as to swamp all his other charitable interests.<sup>4</sup> His cousin, Sir William, we are not surprised to learn, hears of his generosity 'with gaping mouth and staring eyes', not realizing, perhaps, that the most refined philanthropy was thus daily exercising its delicacy up and down the country. Such quaint extravagances merely exaggerate a genuine trend, and if literary moods of the 1760's are in general warmer and more indulgent than those of the 1700's, lending a readier ear to the promptings of intuition and emotion, the credit must go in a notable degree to the philosophers whose thought had given prestige to feeling, and the encouragement of psychological theory to the promptings of sensibility.

<sup>1</sup> I am indebted to Professor John Butt for another piece of evidence. Brown's *Estimate* [5th ed. (1757), p. 21] specifies, among other qualities which he believes have saved Britain from an even more rapid degeneration than the one he deplores, the 'Lenity of our Laws in capital Cases; our Compassion for convicted Criminals; even the general Humanity of our Highwaymen and Robbers, compared with those of other Countries' as 'being concurrent Proofs, that the Spirit of Humanity is natural to our Nation'.

<sup>2</sup> Smollett, *op. cit.* ii. 409-10.

<sup>3</sup> *The Vicar of Wakefield*, ch. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Sarah Scott, *The History of Sir George Ellison* (London, 1766).

## COLERIDGE TRANSCRIBED

By R. FLORENCE BRINKLEY

IT is known that Coleridge, 'The Talker', liked to dictate his material and that he found many friends ready to do the writing for him. Dorothy Wordsworth speaks of the fact that in preparing copy for *The Friend*, Coleridge 'generally dictated to Miss Hutchinson, who takes the words down from his mouth'.<sup>1</sup> Morgan acted as amanuensis for the criticism of *Bertram, or the Castle of St. Aldebrand*,<sup>2</sup> and for several chapters of the *Biographia Literaria*,<sup>3</sup> Gillman for at least the third letter on the *Catholic Emancipation*,<sup>4</sup> and Joseph Henry Green for various philosophical note-books. It is well known that manuscripts were sometimes copied: that Sara Hutchinson copied *Christabel* for Byron, and that John Sterling 'had been permitted to transcribe *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*'.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, there is a note-book in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library which contains 'dear Watson's transcript of an MS. Essay of mine on Faith'. Among other copyists, George Ward should be especially mentioned; 'our amanuensis', as Poole called him, copied the letters from Germany and did much other transcribing. Whether or not Mrs. Coleridge was a willing amanuensis, she at least made Poole a copy of Coleridge's 'Letter to Wilberforce', a letter which originally had been dictated.<sup>6</sup> It is less generally known that many of Coleridge's marginal notes in books were also transcribed.

Some of these marginal notes have been copied off into note-books, and these are at once recognized as duplicates; but some of them were transcribed in other volumes, even other editions, and the hand has been confused with that of Coleridge himself. The result is that the notes, which are authentic as far as content is concerned, are often described as being in Coleridge's autograph when the truth of the matter is that they

<sup>1</sup> Letter to Lady Beaumont, 28 February 1810. *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Middle Years*, ed. E. de Selincourt (Oxford, 1937), i. 358.

<sup>2</sup> On 24 September 1816 Coleridge wrote from Mudiford to Mr. Williams at Grove, Highgate, asking him to send the publishers, Gale and Fenner, 'a roll of papers in Morgan's Handwriting about the "Tragedy of Bertram or the Castle of St. Aldebrand"'. He also asked for a 'Letter on the *Catholic Emancipation*, beginning, I believe, with "My Lord"'. This is 'in dear Mr. Gillman's Handwriting'. Later he repeats the reference: 'Letter to Liverpool (Letter the third, I believe) on the *Catholic Emancipation*'. B.M., Add. MSS. 36, 532, fol. 1(v).

<sup>3</sup> E. L. Griggs, 'An Early Defense of *Christabel*', *Wordsworth and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of George McLean Harper* (Princeton, 1939), p. 174.

<sup>4</sup> See note 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Essays and Tales by John Sterling*, ed. J. C. Hare (London, 1848), i. cxxix.

<sup>6</sup> Coleridge to Poole, 19 January 1801. B.M., Add. MSS. 35, 344, fol. 143v. The transcript of the 'Letter to Wilberforce' is fol. 143r.

have been copied. It is, of course, very essential to be on guard for this distinction.

Much of this copying was done very soon after Coleridge's death. An appeal was made to Coleridge's friends to copy or to lend for copying all unpublished manuscript materials in their possession. Naturally, Poole, who had been Coleridge's close friend and frequent correspondent for many years, was looked to as one of the most valuable contributors; and so only about a month after Coleridge's death his literary executor, Green, wrote to Poole requesting his aid in collecting materials. He said:<sup>1</sup>

I need scarcely say that it is the anxious wish of all his friends that the writings of this great and good man should be collected in order to publication; and I venture therefore to request that any of his Letters or Extracts from the same, which you may possess, or know others to be in possession of, any marginal notes, or MSS. of any kind which you may deem fit for the purpose, may be transmitted to me.

Poole sent many letters in which he carefully marked such passages as he thought should be omitted if the letters were published; he enclosed 'the Sermon and the Remarks which he [Coleridge] made in the margins of some of my Books, which latter Mr. Ward has been so good as to copy';<sup>2</sup> and he made an annotated 'catalogue' of all these materials, stipulating that the manuscripts must be returned to him after Green had finished with them.

Further information concerning the transcriptions made soon after Coleridge's death is given by Mrs. Lucy E. Watson, the granddaughter of Mrs. Gillman. Mrs. Watson says:<sup>3</sup>

From the manuscripts that came into his [Green's] possession he allowed my grandmother to copy anything that she might wish to preserve for herself. These copies she bequeathed to me.

Green delegated the job of editing the *Literary Remains* to Coleridge's nephew, Henry Nelson Coleridge, who also secured the help of a number of people in copying these widely scattered materials. His wife, the poet's daughter, was his most constant helper. In an unpublished letter of 10 January (no year given) he wrote to Mr. Gillman for 'the Shakespeare' that Sara might transcribe it in his absence. He says that 'Baxter and Donne must still wait', but he has noted what Gillman had said about Luther's *Table Talk* and thinks that this book would make an interesting item. Apparently some of the transcriptions had been completed, for he asks that the Highgate carrier 'call at my chambers for Hooker & some

<sup>1</sup> 21 August 1834. B.M., Add. MSS. 35, 344, fol. 198<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> 4 June 1835. B.M., Add. MSS. 35, 344, fol. 201<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Lucy E. Watson, *Coleridge at Highgate* (London and New York, 1925), p. 2.

other books' and apologizes for the fact that he cannot at this time find Mrs. Gillman's copy of Fenelon.<sup>1</sup>

Henry Nelson Coleridge complained that one of his difficulties as editor was in not being able to see all the materials together at one time; but whenever a new source occurred to him, he faithfully continued his efforts to secure additional notes. As late as 10 April 1836 he wrote to Poole: 'And may I request you to say to Mr. Wade, that any communications he may be good enough to make of MS. or marginal notes will be thankfully received.'<sup>2</sup>

Many notes copied into note-books or transcribed on loose sheets of paper are still in the possession of the Coleridge family.<sup>3</sup> A number of these copyists can be readily identified, for some of the transcriptions are signed and others are known through references in other sources. One of Coleridge's own note-books, 'Flycatchers No. 3', was copied by the Reverend Edward Coleridge of Eton. The care which Henry Nelson took to secure correct copies is evidenced by the directions which he gave for copying this manuscript. Inside the front cover he wrote these directions:

1. Write on the right hand pages only.
2. Leave blanks for Greek, Latin, or any passage you can't make out.
3. Leave an *inner* margin, as see the first page, & *don't* page the transcription.
4. Take the utmost care of the MS. herewith sent. H. N. C.

Mary Coleridge, Derwent's wife, signed the S. T. C. notes from Schleiermacher; 'S. D.' signed some notes; and Mr. Elwyn from Philadelphia sent the notes on Leighton, vol. i. Sara Hutchinson was again busy in the service of her late friend. She wrote to Green (10 January, 1835): 'At the request of Mr. Wordsworth I forward to you Copies of all the notes written by Mr. Coleridge in the Books at Rydal Mount—Also some Extracts from a commonplace Book.'

The notes from Luther's *Table Talk* mentioned by Gillman were printed in *Literary Remains*, vol. iv, pp. 1-65, remarkably few omissions or changes being made in the editing. This volume, the first edition, 1652, has great associational value, and its provenance and authenticity can be unquestionably established. In the upper right-hand corner of the first fly-leaf is the name of Edward White, the friend of Charles Lamb. Lamb borrowed the book from White, and while it was in Lamb's library (for Lamb allowed the 'rights of hospitality' to the books of his friends—'let 'em all snug together', he said), Coleridge took it home with him. This is the 'Luster's Tables', which Lamb's maid reported missing. When Lamb

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Raphael King, London dealer in rare books, kindly allowed me to make these notations; since that time the letter has been sold.

<sup>2</sup> B.M., Add. MSS. 35, 344, fol. 127<sup>r</sup>. Mr. Josiah Wade of Bristol.

<sup>3</sup> These note-books and the letter from Sara Hutchinson mentioned below are in the possession of Mr. A. H. B. Coleridge, who generously put these materials at my disposal.

took a look at his library shelves, he found not only the *Table Talk* gone, but also Jeremy Taylor's *Polemicall Discourses*; and so he wrote the humorously serious protest to Coleridge that 'the third shelf (northern compartment) from the top has two devilish gaps, where you have knocked out its two eye-teeth'.<sup>1</sup> He was especially disturbed over Coleridge's taking the *Table Talk*, for, he said, 'It is the property of a friend'. He invited Coleridge and Hartley to 'eat some atoning mutton' with him, bringing the two volumes when they came; but the books were not returned, and Lamb may never have seen the note addressed to him on page 230:

... O for a Luther in the present age! Why, Charles, with the very Handcuffs of his prejudices he would knock out the brains (nay, that is impossible—but) he would split the skulls, of our *Aristogalli*—translate the word as you like—French Christians, or Coxcombs.

Both the Luther and the Taylor volumes came into the hands of Mrs. Watson from Coleridge's library at Highgate and were sold to T. J. Wise. With the purchase of the Wise library by the British Museum they have become available.

Meanwhile the British Museum had acquired a copy of the 1791 edition of Luther's *Table Talk* which was said to have 'MS. notes by S. T. Coleridge'. Now if it were possible to dismiss the book from the library of T. J. Wise as a new kind of forgery, the case would be simple. But in the first place, it is unlikely that Wise, who is not known to have copied any manuscript material and did not like to be put to any personal exertion, should at any time have undertaken the laborious process of copying Coleridge's marginal notes, and in the second place, the evidence is conclusive that it is the 1791 edition which contains the transcribed notes. This edition has the book-plates of Henry Crabb Robinson and Edwin Elkins Field, the friend who came into the possession of many of Robinson's books. Now it is known that Robinson in at least one instance copied Coleridge's marginal notes, for in his diary he spoke of 'copying some marginalia by Coleridge in *Letters Concerning Mind* by Petvin, a book I found at Miss Lamb's on Wednesday and brought away'.<sup>2</sup> It is an enormous task to copy the notes that are in Luther's *Table Talk*, and it is not surprising to find the transcriptions in more than one hand or to find that only a part of the notes have been copied. In fact, less than half the notes in the 1652 edition are transcribed in the 1791 edition, and the transcrip-

<sup>1</sup> This letter is undated, but since the first dated note in the book is 25 September 1819, the letter belongs to the autumn of 1819. *Letters of Charles and Mary Lamb*, ed. E. V. Lucas (New Haven, 1935), ii. 284-5.

<sup>2</sup> *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and Their Writers*, ed. Edith J. Morley (London, 1938), ii. 598. For an account of the Petvin volume and a transcription of the notes, see my article, 'Coleridge on John Petvin and John Locke', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, viii (1945), 277-93.



tions become increasingly sparse in the latter part of the book. In the 1791 edition only two notes appear after page 371, though in the 1652 edition there are twenty-one on the corresponding material. While some of the shorter notes are copied on the margins of the printed pages, all the long notes are transcribed on pieces of paper pasted into the book—half-sheets or strips (torn or cut)—of two or three different kinds of paper. Two pieces bear the watermark, 'Bevan & Swayne', with the date 1832; so it is possible that the copying was done before Coleridge's death. With page 192 the work becomes more systematic, and all these notes (which are in one hand) are numbered, a corresponding number being placed by the passage annotated.

On the title-page of this volume is written: 'This edition is nothing equal to that of 1652—great liberties are taken in this of omissions & alterations.' The annotator begins to list the omitted material on a page pasted between pages 40 and 41, but there are too many omissions for this plan to be satisfactory; and so after copying a few passages for insertion in the proper places, he finally resorts to notations where the omissions occur. When a passage which Coleridge has annotated has been omitted in this edition, however, the passage is copied off before the note is given. Further evidence that this copying is done with no intention to deceive is given by the careful way in which the notes are marked. On the slip pasted between pages 26 and 27, for example, appears this reference: 'Chapter 1 Page 26 note by S. T. C.' Between pages 64 and 65 an omitted passage is copied; but before the note was transcribed, the copyist wrote, 'Note to the above by S. T. C.' In still another place, page 125, we find after the copied passage the comment, 'On which S. T. C. remarks.' The majority of the notes are marked 'S. T. C.', and since more notes are initialed than in the 1652 edition, one gets the impression that it was the purpose of the transcriber to initial all the copied notes. None are signed 'S. T. Coleridge', though there are four notes so signed in the 1652 edition. Only one date occurs in the copied notes; in the 1652 edition, however, there are six dated notes with a difference of ten years between the first and the last.

Coleridge's statement of the relation of Luther's *Table Talk* to his own thought is given in an undated letter to his nephew, Edward Coleridge, a letter now in the Morgan Library in New York:<sup>1</sup>

The Table Talk is next to the Scriptures my main book of meditation—deep, seminataive, pauline, beyond all other works in my possession, it *potentiates* both my Thoughts and my Will. I would, I had all his works.

Perhaps this explains why the book never found its way back to fill the 'devilish gap' in Lamb's library shelf.

<sup>1</sup> This is my reading of the manuscript. Cf. E. L. Griggs, *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1932), ii. 401.

Richard Field's *Of the Church* and Richard Baxter's *Life of Himself*, both recommended to Derwent as especially important for his theological study, were also sold to Wise by Mrs. Watson, and Wise describes each as having notes in Coleridge's autograph. He is so unquestioning that he gives a facsimile of a page of each in the *Ashley Library*;<sup>1</sup> but had he compared his volume of Luther or the manuscripts in his library with this writing, he would have been aware of striking differences.

The notes from Field's *Of the Church*, which appear in *Literary Remains*, are taken from the first edition, 1628. Wise's copy is the third edition, 1635; but Wise passes off the discrepancy as carelessness on the part of the editor, saying, 'The editor of *Literary Remains* failed even to record the date of the folio correctly; he gave it as 1628 instead of 1635'.<sup>2</sup> Henry Nelson Coleridge was, however, editing from the 1628 edition which has the notes in Coleridge's autograph and which is still in the possession of the Coleridge family.

This time, therefore, it is the book purchased by T. J. Wise which contains the copied notes. Although the transcriptions are made directly on the margins of the pages, it is evident that there was no intention of forgery. There is no attempt to make the lines of the notes coincide or even to make the transcriptions coincide as to pages. There is, however, an obvious effort to reproduce the notes exactly, even to Coleridge's characteristic 'it's' for the possessive—though this is not consistently done; but a blank is left where 'fortiori' could not be deciphered, errors are made, and repetitions deleted. There is even such a serious error as 'Kempler' for 'Kepler'; and deletions vary in length from one word to nine consecutive repeated words. The material on one page occupies a different position in the book, being transferred from the first end-page of the 1628 edition to the front board.

In the case of Baxter's *Life of Himself* both volumes containing Coleridge's notes are folios of 1696. Wise calls attention to the fact that the notes in his volume are so copious that they run over on to pieces of paper pasted into the volume. But there is no necessity for pasted-in pages for Coleridge's autograph; the additional space is required because the writing is larger and the notes are less crowded in the transcription. The volume in which the handwriting and signatures are undoubtedly authentic belonged to Coleridge's friend, George Frere, and not only has Frere's book-plate but also the following notation:

This book was lent by me to Sam<sup>l</sup>. Taylor Coleridge at Hampstead & returned to me by his Exors. after his death with his marginal notes.

George Frere.

<sup>1</sup> *Ashley Library* (London, 1926), viii. 96, 99.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 97.

Apparently a copy was made before the volume was returned. George Frere's book eventually made its way into the library of Harvard University.

When one examines the notes in the volume acquired by T. J. Wise, one finds them full of incredible errors. There are omissions and misreadings which reduce the text to nonsense: 'If the Church chose unluckily' becomes 'If the chuse unluckily'; 'vindicated from absurdity, from self-contradiction, and contradiction to the pure reason' becomes 'vindicated from absurdity, from self-contradiction to the pure reason'; and more amusing still 'the force of prejudice' becomes 'the face of prejudice'. Sometimes the copyist's mind supplied a word which did not prove to be Coleridge's, and we read a phrase like this, 'two edged ~~Swords~~ arguments'. Perhaps 'Eickhem' for 'Eichhorn' could be forgiven, and perhaps 'gaured' is a slip of the pen; but what of 'affirmitavely', of 'capatality' for 'capability', or 'scandaze' for 'scandalize'? In the Wise copy also the five end-pages are missing, and Baxter's long note on trichotomy, which is on the last end-page in the Frere volume, is transcribed on the back board.

The discovery of these three sets of duplicated notes throws light on T. M. Raysor's speculation regarding notes in Charles Tennyson-Turner's *Sonnets and Fugitive Pieces*, 1830.<sup>1</sup> Two copies of this book, he says, one in private hands in New York and one in the British Museum, have approximately the same annotations. Since the printed notes contained variations from the manuscript notes in the British Museum copy, Raysor said that they must have been printed from the New York copy, and added that the situation suggested 'that the British Museum notes are copies, not the original marginalia'. He accepted the handwriting in the British Museum copy as authentic, but the hand does not have Coleridge's characteristics, and even the initials are probably only an indication of authorship as in the instances mentioned above.

Although I have seen one other book in which marginal notes said to be by Coleridge and apparently authentic in content are not in Coleridge's hand, I have not come across the volume in which the original notes were written. The British Museum has an annotated copy of *The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty*, by Emanuel Lacunza (Juan Josafat Ben-Ezra), 'translated from the Spanish with a Preliminary Discourse by the Reverend Edward Irving, 1827'. It contains twenty-two notes on Irving's 'Preliminary Discourse', but only three notes on the text itself and no notes after page 41. In fact, the greater portion of Part II of the work is not even opened. The notes from this work which are printed in *Literary Remains* are entirely different and are from a copy now in the library of

<sup>1</sup> *Miscellaneous Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), p. 345.

Lord Coleridge at Ottery St. Mary.<sup>1</sup> Of the fourteen notes printed only one is from the 'Preliminary Discourse', while five are from Part II, on which there are no notes in the British Museum copy. The notes in the British Museum copy present a problem which cannot be solved unless the original marginalia come to light, for there are three references to a note said to be the 'MS. note on the blank leaf at the head of the Vol. Of the Natural Mind of Man'; but this note does not appear among the transcriptions and was not printed in the *Literary Remains*. The transcribed notes are on pieces of paper which have been pasted into the volume. From these strips the paper-maker can be determined as 'Smith & Alnutt', but since no date appears and since the firm was in existence from 1816 to 1854, this information does not assist in dating the marginalia. The notes are signed with the initials of S. T. C. in parenthesis, apparently to indicate copying, and that this was the intention is verified by the fact that the first parenthesis reads 'signed by S. T. C.'. Furthermore, in the notes occasional blank spaces are left where words could not be deciphered, an additional evidence of copying.

It is very apparent that the notes in Irving's book are authentic in content. In several places Irving is referred to Coleridge's own works, and he is called 'my friend', 'dear friend', or 'my brave friend'. In connexion with one doctrinal point (pp. civ-cv) Coleridge says:

Mr. Irving has here set me an example, & in fact has shamed me in my own eyes. I have long entertained the same conviction. . . . But tho' I have long entertained this opinion and have recorded it in my MSS Day Books, I have lacked courage to make known and promulgate the same.

These instances of marginalia transcribed in other volumes of the same work lead one to surmise that there are probably other extant transcriptions which await discovery. One might find, for example, Blanco White's *Evidences against Catholicism* (1825) with a transcription of Coleridge's notes bound in. In July of that year Coleridge wrote to the Reverend Edward Coleridge that the Bishop of London (Bishop Howley) came to see him and 'was so anxious to have the Addenda, I intended for you, transcribed in order to be bound in his Copy, that I let him have them and shall bring them with me when I come'.<sup>2</sup> Since there may be similar cases, marginalia and even manuscripts must be carefully scrutinized and where possible their provenance determined before they are accepted as authentic autographs of S. T. C.

<sup>1</sup> This fact was noted by H. Zimmern, 'Coleridge Marginalia Hitherto Unpublished', *Blackwoods*, cxxxi (1882), 112-13.

<sup>2</sup> E. L. Griggs, *Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1932), ii. 359.

## AURORA VERSUS THE ANGEL

By PAUL TURNER

**A**URORA LEIGH, whatever its faults, undoubtedly lends itself to rapid reading; and one consequence is that passages of more than superficial significance are apt to be passed over without the attention they deserve. The first book, I believe, contains a case in point:

I read a score of books on womanhood  
To prove, if women do not think at all,  
They may teach thinking (to a maiden aunt  
Or else the author),—books that boldly assert  
Their right of comprehending husband's talk  
When not too deep, and even of answering  
With pretty 'may it please you,' or 'so it is,'—  
Their rapid insight and fine aptitude,  
Particular worth and general missionariness,  
As long as they keep quiet by the fire  
And never say 'no' when the world says 'ay,'  
For that is fatal,—their angelic reach  
Of virtue, chiefly used to sit and darn,  
And fatten household sinners,—their, in brief,  
Potential faculty in everything  
Of abdicating power in it: she owned  
She liked a woman to be womanly,  
And English women, she thanked God and sighed  
(Some people always sigh in thanking God),  
Were models to the universe. (i. 427-46.)

The reference to 'books on womanhood' seems to have been interpreted hitherto in a purely general sense. L. S. Boas, for example, sums up the passage as follows: 'For reading matter she was given books on womanhood, books that showed how fine it was for maidens to abjure thinking, to echo the world—and husbands when they acquired them—and to sit peaceably sewing, without a glance at the world of men.'<sup>1</sup> G. M. Merlette is equally indefinite: 'Et cependant, elle lisait maint livre sur les femmes, où l'on enseignait la contre-partie des doctrines féministes de nos jours.'<sup>2</sup> A general interpretation of the passage is made the more tempting by a certain ambiguity about the first few lines. Who, for instance, is the 'maiden aunt'—Aurora's aunt, the Maiden Aunt as a type, or a particular maiden aunt in one of the 'books on womanhood'? Who is 'the author'—

<sup>1</sup> L. S. Boas, *Elizabeth Barrett Browning* (London, 1930), p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> Germaine Marie Merlette, *La Vie et l'Œuvre d'Elizabeth Barrett Browning* (Paris, 1905), p. 253.

the author of the books, or, by a facetious periphrasis for the writer of the poem, *Aurora Leigh* herself? Are the books in question composed by men, or by women? I suggest, and shall try to demonstrate, that Mrs. Browning here refers, not to a general class of literature, but to one particular book, *The Angel in the House*; that 'the maiden aunt' is Aunt Maude, and 'the author' is Felix Vaughan, alias Coventry Patmore.

I base this theory mainly on the fact that there are numerous points of resemblance, both in language and in thought, between this passage in *Aurora Leigh*, and the first two books of *The Angel in the House*. Before enumerating these resemblances, however, I should perhaps anticipate the objection that many of them are trivial or inexact. Individually, I admit, not one would provide an adequate basis for argument; but collectively, and in their cumulative effect, they do seem to indicate a correspondence between the two works, far too complex to be explained by mere coincidence. I hope, therefore, to carry my point, if not by the reliability of the witnesses called, then at least by their number.

The first point to be noticed is that *The Angel in the House*, though not exactly a 'book on womanhood' itself, does contain one poem of which Womanhood is both the subject and the title:

- Be man's hard virtues highly wrought,  
 But let my gentle Mistress be,  
 In every look, word, deed, and thought,  
 Nothing but sweet and womanly.  
 5 Her virtues please my virtuous mood,  
 But what at all times I admire  
 Is, not that she is wise or good,  
 But just the thing which I desire.  
 With versatility to bring  
 10 Her mental tone to any strain,  
 If off'nest she is anything,  
 Be it thoughtless, talkative, and vain.  
 That seems in her supremest grace  
 Which, virtue or not, apprises me  
 15 That my familiar arms embrace  
 Unfathomable mystery.

('Espousals', pp. 151-2; Canto VIII, p. 121.)<sup>1</sup>

Here we find the general implication that woman, while thoughtless herself,

<sup>1</sup> Where two references are given for quotations from *The Angel in the House*, the first applies to the original edition (published by John W. Parker, London, 1854-6), and the second (for the convenience of readers who do not possess the first edition) to the first one-volume edition of Patmore's complete poetical works, published by G. Bell and Sons in 1906, and reprinted in 1909, 1915, 1921, and 1928. The appearance of one reference only indicates that the lines in question were omitted by Patmore in his later revisions. The actual wording quoted is, of course, invariably that of the first edition.



gives man food for thought by her 'unfathomable mystery'; Miss Leigh's wish—'She liked a woman to be womanly'—has its counterpart in line 4, 'fine aptitude' in lines 9 and 10, and 'angelic reach of virtue' in line 5. It should also be observed that the somewhat patronizing tone of the whole poem, especially of lines 7 and 8, is perfectly calculated to stir the resentment of an ardent feminist like Mrs. Browning.

Now, to consider the *Aurora Leigh* passage in detail: the idea that a thoughtless woman may 'teach thinking to a maiden aunt', demands comparison with Idyll II of 'The Espousals', originally entitled 'Aunt Maude'. The theme of this Idyll is that Honoria, the woman, is in the grip of a purely irrational passion for Felix Vaughan, and that Aunt Maude, the maiden aunt, is thereby compelled to do the thinking; that is, to consider the financial and social disadvantages of the proposed marriage. At the climax of the episode the aunt shows that she can not only think to good purpose on this subject, but can embarrass Vaughan by penetrating his thoughts also: throughout dinner he struggles to overcome her disapproval, by agreeing with her every opinion, when suddenly—

she, with unexpected tack,  
 'My niece has told you every word  
 I said of you. What may I mean?  
 Of course she has: but you've not heard  
 How I abused you to the Dean;—  
 Yes, I'll take wine;—he's mad, like her;  
 And she *will* have you: there it ends.  
 And, now I've done my duty, Sir,  
 And you've shown common-sense, we're friends.'  
 ('Espousals', p. 33; Canto II, p. 90.)

Nor is this the end of Aunt Maude's 'thought': Idyll VII of 'The Espousals' concludes with an epigrammatic specimen of her wisdom:

'Go on flattering, Sir;  
 A woman's like the Koh-in-noor,  
 Worth just the price that's put on her.'  
 ('Espousals', p. 103; Canto VIII, p. 123.)

Here, clearly enough, is a woman teaching a maiden aunt to think; a woman teaching the author, that is, Felix Vaughan, to think, is a situation which appears several times in the *Angel in the House*. First, there is the beginning of Idyll II of 'The Betrothal':

One morning, after Church, I walk'd  
 Alone with Mary on the Lawn,  
 And felt myself, howe'er we talked,  
 To high thoughts delicately drawn.  
 ('Betrothal', p. 35; Canto II, p. 15.)

Then there is the reference in Idyll I of 'The Betrothal' to the Dean's late wife:

She seem'd expressly sent below  
To teach our erring minds to see  
The rhythmic change of time's swift flow  
As part of calm eternity.

('Betrothal', p. 19; Canto I, p. 9.)

In Idyll XI of 'The Betrothal', the sight of Honoria engaged in the eminently unintellectual activity of dancing excites in Felix a train of thought two pages long, at the end of which he recognizes explicitly that she has been his unconscious teacher:

This learn'd I, watching where she danced . . .

('Betrothal', p. 163; Canto XI, p. 68.)

But perhaps the best expression of this theme is to be found in the Prologue to 'The Betrothal', where woman is represented as capable of inspiring man, not only to thought, but to the composition of the highest poetry:

'In green and undiscover'd ground,  
Yet near where many others sing,  
I have the very well-head found  
Whence gushes the Pierian Spring.'  
Then she: 'What is it, Dear? The Life  
Of Arthur, or Jerusalem's Fall?'  
'Neither: your gentle self, my wife,  
Yourself, and love that's all in all.'

('Betrothal', p. 5; Prologue, p. 4.)

It should be noticed that this passage exemplifies the theme, as well as expressing it; for while the man's thoughts are set forth at several pages' length, the woman's find their outlet in a single question, of unexampled futility.

Next comes Mrs. Browning's ironical allusion to woman's 'right of comprehending husband's talk, when not too deep'. This has its counterpart in Patmore's summing up of the intellectual relationship of husband and wife:

Back to the babe the woman dies;  
And all the wisdom that she has  
Is to love him for being wise.

('Espousals', p. 94; Canto VIII, p. 119.)

I do not, of course, mean to exclude the possibility that Mrs. Browning may also have had in mind Section XCVII of *In Memoriam*, where the wife's position is epitomized in the words: 'I cannot understand: I love.'

The dutiful answer, 'May it please you', should perhaps be regarded as

a mere phrase of politeness, without any literal significance; in view of its context, however, it is surely not irrelevant to observe that *The Angel in the House* abounds in statements of the feminine talent for pleasing the male; of which the most provocative instance occurs in the lines:

Man must be pleased; but him to please  
Is woman's pleasure . . .

('Betrothal', p. 125; Canto IX, p. 52.)

The assertion that women make up for their inability to think by their 'rapid insight' is, of course, a commonplace; but, like several other commonplaces, it is dignified by deliberate inclusion in Patmore's poem. The catalogue of woman's virtues in 'The Rose of the World' contains the following item:

No faithless thought her instinct shrouds,  
But fancy chequers settled sense . . .

('Betrothal', p. 58; Canto IV, p. 24.)

'The Parallel', in the course of a comparison between the faculties of the two sexes, elaborates the same idea:

Or say she wants the patient brain  
To track shy truth; her facile wit  
At that which he hunts down with pain  
Flies straight, and does exactly hit.

('Betrothal', p. 71; Canto V, p. 31.)

A counterpart for the phrase, 'fine aptitude', has already been found in the poem, 'Womanhood'; I am nevertheless tempted to compare it with another line in 'The Rose of the World', where one female excellence is expounded in language so strikingly Patmorean, that it could scarcely fail to lodge in the reader's memory:

Connubial aptitude exact . . .

('Betrothal', p. 59; Canto IV, p. 25.)

The idea of woman's 'general missionariness' so well sums up the central philosophy of *The Angel in the House*, that it may seem unnecessary to find individual expressions of it; for the sake of completeness, however, I hope that I may be allowed to give two isolated illustrations:

And when we knelt, she seemed to be  
An angel teaching me to pray . . .

('Betrothal', p. 150; Canto X, p. 63.)

I loved her in the name of God,  
And for the ray she was of Him . . .

('Betrothal', p. 147; Canto X, p. 61.)

The point at which Mrs. Browning's satire becomes most scathing is when she writes of 'their, in brief, Potential faculty in everything Of abdicating power in it': an exact parallel is to be found in Idyll XII of 'The Betrothal', where Honoria, in accepting Felix, is represented as relinquishing all independent status:

My queen was crouching at my side,  
By love unseptrd and brought low . . .  
(*'Betrothal'*, p. 181; Canto XII, p. 75.)

Still more significant is the title of the whole Idyll, 'The Abdication'.

There remains only the reference to English women as 'models to the universe'. A replica of this idea, differing in its degree of hyperbole alone, occurs in the introduction to Idyll XII of 'The Espousals':

Praise then my Book, where'er it comes,  
Ladies, whose innocence makes bright  
England, the land of courtly homes,  
The world's exemplar and delight.  
(*'Espousals'*, p. 166.)

Having noted all these points of resemblance between the two poems, one can hardly escape the conclusion that the phrase in which Mrs. Browning's feminist protest reaches its climax is itself a veiled, but perfectly intelligible parody of the very title of Patmore's poem: 'Their *angelic* reach Of virtue, chiefly used to sit and darn, And fatten *household* sinners.'

So much for the internal indications: what of the time factor? 'The Betrothal' was published in 1854; but would Mrs. Browning have had an opportunity of reading 'The Espousals', published in the same year as *Aurora Leigh*, before sending her own poem to press? There is, first of all, a possibility, almost amounting to a probability, that she saw *The Angel in the House*, Book II, before its publication: she had certainly seen Patmore's 'Tamerton Church-Tower' in manuscript, for in September 1853 she writes from Bagni di Lucca: 'As to Mr Patmore's new volume of poems, my husband and I had the pleasure of reading in MS. the poem which gives its title to the book.'<sup>1</sup> There seems reason to suppose that *The Angel in the House*, Book II, was practically finished some time before publication: Sir Edmund Gosse writes: 'The explanation of this delay seems to be that although "The Betrothal", and perhaps "The Espousals", were practically sketched out in 1850, their finish did not satisfy a taste which was rapidly becoming fastidious.'<sup>2</sup> Moreover, apropos of Patmore's 1853 volume,<sup>3</sup> Robert Browning had written:

My old admiration for your genius continues unabated of course; but why,

<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Letters* (London, 1897), ii. 138.

<sup>2</sup> Edmund Gosse, *Coventry Patmore* (London, 1905), p. 63.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

why have you not ere this turned it pale, as only yourself could, by the side of some as genuine new delight at some as unmistakeable manifestation as the first? So wonders my wife, too, who is as truly your well-wisher, dear Mr. Patmore, as yours ever faithfully, R. Browning.<sup>1</sup>

What could be more natural than that Patmore, thus challenged and encouraged, should have showed the Brownings the earliest presentable draft of 'the love poem of the age'?

But even if Mrs. Browning did not see 'The Espousals' in manuscript, she could still have read the published version before sending *Aurora Leigh* to press. The second book of *The Angel in the House* was published early in July;<sup>2</sup> on 31 July Carlyle wrote to Patmore: 'I had received your beautiful little Book, "Angel in the House", Book II, some time ago; and reserved it for a good opportunity which I saw ahead.'<sup>3</sup> The Brownings arrived in London towards the end of June,<sup>4</sup> and on a date after 9 July, Mrs. Browning wrote to her sister, referring to her 'poem which is only *nearly* ready for the press—writing for hours every day; and though I am nearly at the end of transcription, there will be much besides to see to'.<sup>5</sup> Assuming that she did not see 'The Espousals' in manuscript, I would suggest that she read a published copy before the date of this letter, and at once determined that among her 'highest convictions upon Life and Art' her strong antipathy to the thought of *The Angel in the House* should be given adequate expression; the 'much besides to see to' may thus be supposed to have included the insertion into Book I of a vehement protest against 'books on womanhood'.

So far, I have attempted to justify my theory on grounds of general probability: I should, perhaps, conclude by indicating what interesting consequences would follow from the acceptance of the proposed interpretation. First of all, it would clear Mrs. Browning from the imputation of negligent ambiguity; the double meaning would be deliberate, dictated by the necessity for relieving her feelings, without wounding those of a friend. Secondly, it would explain the violence of Patmore's own reactions to *Aurora Leigh*. On 14 December 1856, two months after the publication of the poem, he wrote in a letter to Allingham: 'Have you read *Aurora Leigh*? Is it not strange that writers, and still more that readers—should prefer shrieking G or F to singing E or D?'<sup>6</sup> Two months later he returns

<sup>1</sup> B. Champneys, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Coventry Patmore* (London, 1900), ii. 316.

<sup>2</sup> *The Athenaeum* of 5 July 1856 (cccxlili. 839) contains a 'List of New Books', in which the second entry is as follows: 'Angel in the House, Book 2, "The Espousals", fc. 8vo, 6s., cl.'

<sup>3</sup> B. Champneys, *op. cit.*, ii. 311.

<sup>4</sup> G. M. Merlette, *op. cit.*, p. 249.

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *Letters to her Sister, 1846-1859* (London, 1929), p. 251.

<sup>6</sup> B. Champneys, *op. cit.*, ii. 183.

to the subject in a letter to the same correspondent: 'Aurora Leigh is a strange book for a modest sensible little woman like Mrs Browning to have written. It is full of "fine things" of course; but I am inexpressibly sick of such under such circumstances.'<sup>1</sup> A further two months passed, and his anger, so far from abating, had become even more shrill and spiteful: 'The article in the National on Aurora Leigh is not mine. I should not have called it "a great poem" in any other than a material sense. It reminds me of an ill-conditioned child jumping at the stars and stamping on the flowers.

Standing on the head makes not  
Either for ease or dignity,

someone says, and the operation becomes still more undignified when the performer wears flounces.'<sup>2</sup>

*Aurora Leigh* and *The Angel in the House* have superficially a great deal in common. Both are verse-novels, both set out to glorify love, and both make deliberate use of the apparently prosaic elements of ordinary nineteenth-century life; but Patmore's philosophy was in almost every way the antithesis of Mrs. Browning's, and it was wholly to be expected that he would disapprove of *Aurora Leigh*. Nevertheless, is not some more specific explanation required for the fact that he not only disapproved, but was positively angry; that the passage of six months only served to make that anger more malicious; and that the tone of his criticism had more in it of personal abuse than of aesthetic or philosophic evaluation? Mrs. Browning, after all, was a friend, and the wife of a friend; and, unless my theory is correct, she had never been anything but complimentary about Patmore's own efforts. I suggest an explanation on the following lines: in July 1856 the second book of 'the love poem of the age' was presented to the world. The poet waited anxiously for the world's reactions: the world did not react. In two months, not a single review had appeared; and on 1 September Patmore wrote, in a tone so petulant as to be almost pathetic: 'The total silence of the press about "The Espousals", in face of things that are being said and written privately about it by men of the best literary name in England, is very odd and unexpected.'<sup>3</sup> A month later *Aurora Leigh* appeared. In normal circumstances he would probably have paid it little attention, and would have overlooked—as Mrs. Browning intended—the significance of the 'womanhood' passage; but the contrast was too bitter: his own poem had been received in silence, *Aurora Leigh* was welcomed with a tumult of acclaim. Naturally he studied the rival production with a gloomy interest, and naturally, in his hypersensitive state of mind, he

<sup>1</sup> B. Champneys, op. cit. ii., p. 185.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 186.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., i. 171.



recognized the veiled attack upon his own work. Dignity forbade that he should put into the minds of others what was at present obvious only to himself; consequently his resentment could find expression only in general depreciation of *Aurora Leigh*. On one solitary occasion, however, he seems to have tried to make the punishment fit the crime, to counter the covert attack with a covert retaliation: it was not merely egotism that made him quote his own lines:

Standing on the head makes not  
Either for ease or dignity.<sup>1</sup>

It was poetic justice, after all, that the Angel should provide the stick with which to beat Aurora.

<sup>1</sup> 'The Betrothal', p. 109; Canto VII, p. 42 (see p. 234, n. 2 above).

## NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

### ‘NEVER CALL A TRUE PIECE OF GOLD A COUNTERFEIT’: WHAT FALSTAFF MEANS

**I**T is surprising, and perhaps a little perverse, to catch from the lips of Milton's Samson the echo of an expression, probably half-proverbial, which may help to elucidate Falstaff's plea to Prince Hal when the 'play extempore' is interrupted by the Sheriff's knocking,<sup>1</sup> yet in Samson's bitter reflection

How counterfeit a coin are they who friends  
Bear in their superscription,

we may find a clue to the meaning which has proved so elusive in Falstaff's expostulation:

Dost thou heare Hal? Never call a true piece of gold a counterfet, thou art essentially made without seeming so.

*Prin.* And thou a naturall coward without instinct.

Milton provides three terms 'counterfeit . . . coin . . . friends': Shakespeare only two, so that Falstaff's remark is cryptic through slipping of the third term 'friend', obvious perhaps by Shakespeare's train of thought and by common association. But although such an equation seems obvious once it is proposed, others have been preferred, and 'a true piece of gold' has been variously explained as *honesty*, *royalty*, *safety*, *sanity*. Other difficulties in the passage have teased and tangled it into a critic's knot. *Essentially made* is puzzling; first, because of a tempting variant in Folio 3 of *mad* for *made*, which has been accepted by many editors, among them Malone and Professor Dover Wilson, and is the reading of the Globe edition; and second, because of the term *essentially* where the degree, and consequently the implication, of alchemical metaphor are in dispute.

In an attempt, not to aggravate but, to allay the confusion I would draw attention to a passage in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, which runs as follows:

A Golden treasure is the tryed frend.  
But whoe may gold from counterfaytes defend?  
Trust not to sone, ne all to lyght mistrust.  
With thone thy selfe, with thother thy frend thou hurtst.  
Whoe twyneth betwyxt, and steareth the golden meane,  
Nor rashely loveth, nor mistrusteth in vayne.  
For frendshyp poyson, for safeteye mithridrate  
Hit is, thy frend to love as thou wouldest hate.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Henry IV*, II. iv. 547-51, Globe Ed.

<sup>2</sup> *The seconde Parte of the Myrrour for Magistrates* (1563), ed. L. B. Campbell (Cambridge, 1938), p. 281.

This occurs in the tragedy entitled 'Howe the Lord Hastynges was betrayed by trustyng to much to his evyl counsayler Catesby, and vilanously murdered in the tower of London by Richarde Duke of Glocestre', which was 'penned by maister Dolman'.<sup>1</sup>

At the crisis when Catesby his friend is about to play him false, Hastings enlarges on the betrayal and looks round for some parallel treachery to qualify the shame:

... me to comfort, that I aloane, ne seeme  
Of all dame natures workes, left in extreme.<sup>2</sup>

The argument in the sententious verse which follows is fully developed and fairly obvious but it is not banal; the expression is, or would be, epigrammatic. In the editions of 1574 (reissued 1575) and 1578 the last two lines (343-4) have been simplified to:

In frendship soveraigne it is as mithridate  
Thy frend to love as one whome thou mayst hate.

The theme, that is, the limits and conditions of trust between two people, is substantially the same. Dolman is elaborate with good reason considering Hastings's situation and takes his rhetorical chances. Shakespeare's style is allusive, the hint is to be enough for Hal if only he will take it. The threat is very lightly touched and the point is urged by a compliment. But Shakespeare has, I believe, passed this way. Two such correspondences between the *Mirror* and the play, not in themselves important but valuable as supporting evidence, indicate this. At l. 96 comes the adjective 'tricklyng' for tears, and at ll. 281-3, a tell-tale reference to the lion's instinct:

Whye slaunder I Lyons? They feare the sacred lawes  
Of prynces bloud.

An explanatory paraphrase of the disputed passage in *1 Henry IV* is the better for a long-distance approach. It will be remembered that when the inquiry into Falstaff's running away has gone as far as he finds comfortable, he takes pains to change the subject:

why thou knowest I am as valiant as Hercules: but beware instinct, the lion will not touch the true prince, instinct is a great matter. I was now a coward on instinct, I shall thinke the better of my selfe, and thee during my life; I for a valiant lion, and thou for a true prince: but by the Lord, lads, I am glad you have the money, Hostesse clap to the doores, watch to night, pray to morrowe, gallants, lads, boyes, hearts of golde, all the titles of good fellowship come to you. What shall wee bee merrie, shall wee have a play extempore?

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 268, 244, and Introd., pp. 44-6.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 281.

The first summoning of the Prince to court gives him his dramatic argument. Falstaff poses as the King to practise Hal in his answer and quiets the Hostess who is crying with laughter, 'Weepe not sweet Queene, for trickling teares are vain'. At the second turn (or 'act') of this mimicry Hal takes on the King's part and, in the person of the Prince, Falstaff pleads for himself, working up to 'banish not him thy Harries companie, banish plumpe Iacke, and banish all the world'. To this his Harry has just time to make the sinister answer, 'I do, I will', before the second knocking interrupts them. There is a flurry on the stage. The mock-Prince would continue: 'play out the play, I have much to say in the behalfe of that Falstafffe.' He is not heeded, so he tries again, 'Listen, Hal. Don't ever make the blunder of mistaking a true gold (friend) for a sham (and flatterer).' 'Plump Jack' is probably in his mind as this genuine friend, and it would be a sin to mistrust him. Then turning to the heir-apparent who is both counterfeiting the King before his time and, as Falstaff would hope, feigning annoyance as a friend when he is really quite well disposed towards his old fat companion, he carries on his metaphor into a compliment: 'you are the real thing all right (good metal)', adding with an irresistible quip, 'though you don't look like it'. He laughs as he says it and hopes the good humour will be catching. But the Prince is out to snub and picking up his 'you' by 'thou' and playing off the word 'essentially' repeats, for the fifth time, the jibe about cowardice and instinct. This, as it stands, is weakly turned and calls for some explanation by reference to the alchemical jargon and to the wider context. Cowl, the 'Arden' editor, notes that "The word 'natural' in the Prince's reply seems to require 'naturally' as the meaning of 'essentially'". Overbury has been cited for a contrast of 'essentially' and 'fainedly' and Thomas Vaughan also a generation later, but well within the period, for a more perfect parallel in *Lumen de Lumine* (1651).

This interpretation I would accept in preference to the attractive ingenuity of R. Flatter's suggestion offered in the *T.L.S.*<sup>1</sup> For him the operative word is *made* with a damaging implication as it is contrasted with what is natural. According to this interpretation Falstaff argues: 'Don't give me away: I am genuine gold, in reality it is *thou* who art a counterfeit, a piece of *made* gold,' and this is capped by the Prince's 'thou a coward—not a counterfeit but a natural one'. The new interpretation is tempting but it throws the phrasing out of balance and what is far more important it misconstrues Falstaff's intention. It is surely not his policy to insult at this juncture. He is trying to jockey the Prince into affirming the value of this 'plump Jack'. Once again, if this retort stood alone I could not but agree with the objection of the Editor of the Variorum that, 'Hal's reply

<sup>1</sup> 6 Oct. 1945, p. 475.

... is more appropriate in answer to "mad"; "Thou art a natural madman", says Falstaff, "and thou a natural coward", replies the Prince, but it does not stand alone, it is part of a larger system of chaffing, and it is clear by now that Hal is going to harp on 'coward' and 'instinct' with any poor excuse; his very persistence is both natural and funny and counts for more than an immediate neatness of repartee. The 'essentially-natural' hinge will serve and Falstaff takes the hint, drops the friendship theme, and argues on the new line: 'I deny your Maior (premise).'

Without the help of the *Mirror* Cowl seems to come nearest to the interpretation I offer here: the only difference between us is that he assumes that Hal is referred to throughout, whereas I think it more likely that Falstaff carries over his concern with his own merits as a companion, and continues his pleading by referring to himself in 'never call a true piece of gold a counterfeit', and then changes his reference by the inflexion of 'thou' as he turns to the Prince's quality. Furness was obviously attracted by, but suspicious of, Cowl's explanation of the 'generally rejected reading of Quarto I'; he finds it 'subtle and ingenious, perhaps too subtle to be possible as the interpretation of lines in a stage play. A literal, and certain interpretation is obviously impossible.'

To this it may be argued that while a 'literal' interpretation is not only 'impossible' but out of character yet the dialogue is alive with literary allusion. As an interpretation to be conveyed from the stage Cowl's (or mine) is well within the range of gesture and tone once the actor is himself possessed of the meaning, though it would, I take it, have been more obvious to the generations of Shakespeare and Milton than to our own. The passage cannot be cut and there are obviously ways of making a sense *ad hoc* with either reading, 'made' or 'mad', and even with any of the suggested equivalents for the 'piece of true gold', but there is more to be said for this 'made' than Furness (and Cowl, for that matter) think.

The advantage of associating Dolman's palpable observation with Falstaff's cryptic remark would be to clear a way through the confusion of suppositions and by establishing the equation of true gold with friendship to clarify the sequence of ideas that go through Falstaff's brain. With the *Mirror*'s 'sententia' in mind it seems almost embarrassingly easy but it needs the hint to confirm which of several possible equivalents for the 'gold' is likely to fit in with Falstaff's two preoccupations, both with the rhetorical concern as he carries on along the lines of the improvised peroration in praise of Jack as a companion, and with his personal anxiety as he is alarmed by the immediate threat to his pleasant relationship with Hal. To have been given this clue is at least useful, but there is also, I think, a further interest when in following the trail of the literary allusion we see what makes Falstaff remember Hastings and Catesby and try to manage

his own affairs in time. This irony is certainly *not* for the stage, it is an allusion, and perhaps an involuntary one, not to be confused with the quotation and parody used elsewhere in the scene. It is as though for a moment we can spy what has caught on the lime-twigs of Shakespeare's memory.

K. M. LEA

#### HOUSMAN ON GALSWORTHY: MORE MARGINALIA

THE antipathy of A. E. Housman for John Galsworthy, not only for his works but apparently for the man too, is well known to those acquainted with the author of *A Shropshire Lad*. As early as 1903 A. E. H. agreed to contribute to his brother's annual, *The Venture*, only on the condition that the volume did not include Galsworthy.<sup>1</sup> He later told Laurence that he would refuse the Order of Merit, if it were offered, because it had been awarded to Galsworthy.<sup>2</sup> And he also explained to L. H. that he would not sign his memorial in favour of women's suffrage because Galsworthy was certain to sign it.<sup>3</sup> Another witness, Dr. Percy Withers, calls this dislike so violent and pronounced that he avoided mentioning it to the poet; once more, in 1928, Housman declined to be one of Thomas Hardy's pall-bearers because Galsworthy was similarly honoured, but finally capitulated after J. M. Barrie's entreaties.<sup>4</sup> Grant Richards speaks of Housman's inability to 'abide' Galsworthy and of the poet's definite distaste for the novels; but Richards simply quotes others four times, and can only add that it was 'for some reason of which he never spoke to me'.<sup>5</sup>

Thus when one finds a copy of a Galsworthy novel from Housman's library, one naturally, knowing both A. E. H.'s dislike of the author and his habit of writing marginalia, anticipates lively comment. In a cheap paper edition of *The Man of Property* (London: William Heinemann, 1907), now in the library of Mr. H. B. Collamore,<sup>6</sup> Housman has five times given

<sup>1</sup> Laurence Housman, *The Unexpected Years* (London, 1937), p. 203.

<sup>2</sup> Laurence Housman, *A. E. H.* (London, 1937), p. 112.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 174.

<sup>4</sup> Percy Withers, *A Buried Life* (London, 1940), p. 100.

<sup>5</sup> Grant Richards, *Housman: 1897-1936* (Oxford, 1941), p. 253; cf. also pp. 247, 341, 393. Incidentally, a search of Galsworthy literature, letters, and biography reveals no mention of A. E. Housman.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Collamore, of Hartford, Conn., U.S.A., for whom the book was purchased at the sale of Housman's library, has graciously given permission to publish these passages, which are definitely in the poet's handwriting; not only were they compared with an authentic autograph letter, but I have seen hundreds of Housman letters and manuscripts, including the notebooks in the Library of Congress, and can attest to the genuineness of the hand in the marginalia. As usual, Housman did not sign his name anywhere in the book; but it does bear the tiny bookplate inserted after his death in most of the volumes sold at the auction.



vent to his feelings, though the remarks are all short. The longest is on p. 139, at the end of Part III, Chapter V, where Timothy appears for the first time and abruptly retires [1922 edition (New York), p. 262]; Housman has pencilled against the last four paragraphs, 'the point of this incident is never explained'. The remaining marginalia are even shorter. Against Galsworthy's sentence on p. 95, 'And suddenly the moon appeared, young and tender, floating up on her back from behind a tree' (1922 edition, p. 178), Housman has written, 'you liar!' On p. 91, where the novelist calls nature's moods 'violent spring flashing white on almond-blossom through purple clouds' (1922 edition, p. 172), A. E. H. has written, 'nonsense'.<sup>1</sup> And there is another 'nonsense' on p. 83 opposite a ridiculous little poem which begins 'Kiss me, Mother, ere I die' (1922 edition, p. 156). In the last line of this poem 'd-d-die' is underlined, as are the word 'waltzes' two sentences later, and the last three notes of a bar of music, with exclamation points against the whole paragraph and the music. At the beginning of Part II, Chapter II, describing a dinner party at Soames's house, where June and Bosinney are guests (1922 edition, p. 105), Housman gives his four-word marginal opinion of Galsworthy's attempt to evoke a mood of restraint: 'How not to write'.

These marginalia do not, of themselves, lead to conclusions concerning either man. They are sparse and laconic, at times intemperate, and could have been the products of momentary moods. But, added to other evidence, they point to an attitude of Housman towards Galsworthy that amounts to detestation. Granted that the respective authors of *A Shropshire Lad* and *The Forsyte Saga* are worlds apart on such points as morality, sentimentality, pity, and (on matters of technique) incision; it is still difficult to explain Housman's scornful disparagement of the novelist. His slurs upon Galsworthy were private: abrupt statements to intimate friends, secret marginal defamation in books; and the suspicion may arise that his sentiments were based upon a personal prejudice of some sort rather than upon critical disapproval of Galsworthy's works. Unfortunately no evidence so far uncovered gives any ground for conjecture about the reason for such a prejudice.

WILLIAM WHITE

<sup>1</sup> In another item in Mr. Collamore's library, John Masfield's 'The Daffodil Fields', *The English Review*, xiii (1913, Feb.), 338, Housman intends similarly to correct Masfield's natural history. Masfield, speaking of three fields where daffodils are found, describes The Roughs (or Poor Maid's Hall) in the spring: warm afternoon, light evening, daffodils shaking beside the brook, grass turning green, 'And blue dog-violets come and glistening celandine' (l. 42). A. E. H. has underlined 'blue dog-violets come' and pencilled in the margin, 'they don't'.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### STEWART OF BALDYNNEIS AND ARIOSTO

THE EDITOR,  
*The Review of English Studies.*

Sir,

In his interesting and valuable 'Notes on the Poems of John Stewart of Baldynneis' (*R.E.S.* xxiv [1948], 12-18), Mr. Matthew P. McDiarmid, referring to that writer's *Abbregement of Roland furious*, has quoted my description of Stewart, in *The Works of William Fowler* (S.T.S., iii (1940), cxviii), as 'a poet in whom Italian influence was almost certainly strained through French', and has assumed that by this it was meant to deny Stewart any direct knowledge of Ariosto's text. May I point out, however, that the words quoted were a provisional judgement, and did not imply that I considered Stewart ignorant of his original, but merely that his approach to it was through French channels—an opinion amply borne out by a fuller consideration of the poem, such as I have given in *Italian Studies*, iii (1946), 65-82. In this article, which was apparently not known to Mr. McDiarmid, the extent of Stewart's debt to the Italian original is fully admitted and illustrated, and some of his best passages are shown to derive from Ariosto and not from Desportes. In these, Scots Renaissance rhetoric attains some of its most brilliant effects, and I entirely agree with Mr. McDiarmid that Stewart has been unduly neglected in favour of Montgomerie.

Yours faithfully,  
JOHN PURVES

## REVIEWS

**Le Manuel des Péchés: Étude de littérature religieuse anglo-normande (xiii<sup>me</sup> siècle).** By E. J. ARNOULD. Pp. ix+451. Paris: E. Droz, 1940. No price given.

**The Book of Vices and Virtues: A Fourteenth Century English Translation of the *Somme le Roi* of Lorens d'Orléans.** Pp. lxxxii+378. Edited from the three extant MSS. by W. Nelson Francis. (E.E.T.S. Orig. Series No. 217.) London: Humphrey Milford, 1942. 52s. 6d.

These two recent books are a most welcome addition to the still far-too-slender library of those interested in our medieval didactic literature and in the general pulpit revival of the thirteenth century which did so much to promote it. Here, once again, we are indebted to students from overseas for harvesting what Englishmen have so persistently evaded. The masterly French studies of *exempla* by Father Welter and of the *Artes Predicandi* by Father Charland of Ottawa are now succeeded by Professor Arnould's able monograph, which, as his sub-title rightly indicates, extends far beyond the limits of a single Anglo-Norman tract, while Mr. Francis adds yet another name to the ever-growing list of competent American editors of Early English texts. Both of them assert refreshingly that their main concern is with the light thrown by their respective documents on the life and religion of the period rather than with linguistic features, although the latter are by no means neglected.

The *Manuel des Péchés*, like the French original of the *Book of Vices and Virtues* and, indeed, the essence of the new popular sermon technique developed by the friars, springs in the first instance from the papal reforms of Innocent III and the decrees of the IVth Lateran Council concerning clerical ignorance and the lack of adequate lay instruction, in the early part of the thirteenth century. In his opening chapter M. Arnould retraces the spread of this influence by way of subsequent regional Councils, Synods, and episcopal injunctions, and links the programme of the *Manuel* more particularly with the enterprise of Bishop Grossetête and his diocesan Constitutions of 1238, which he regards as the most significant of the English series. Likewise, the 21st Canon of the same Lateran Council dealing with Confession gave rise, in due course, to a new realistic treatment of sins, involving minute concentration on their various 'branches' and the diverse circumstances of the sinners, social as well as personal, so well mirrored in innumerable *Summae de Penitentia* and *de Casibus Conscientiae*.<sup>1</sup> To this influence, then, is largely due the remarkable development of realism in medieval preaching and didactic literature generally from the period of the *Manuel* onwards, with all that it involved for the greater vernacular age of Langland and Chaucer to come.

After a detailed critical examination of the various sections of his text, its subject-matter, original plan and problems of authenticity, and the mutual

<sup>1</sup> A recent article in *Speculum* for April 1947, on 'The Cultural Tradition of *Handlyng Synne*' by D. W. Robertson, Jun., pp. 162-85, again stresses this influence.

relations of the manuscripts, M. Arnould turns to the *exempla*, which occupy more than half of the original verse. 'Ce fait suffirait à lui seul pour donner à l'ouvrage une réelle originalité, car il est par là le premier traité religieux et didactique en langue vulgaire qui ait, en Angleterre, fait de l'*exemplum* un emploi abondant et systématique.' Completing the good work begun by M. Gaston Paris and much extended by Mr. J. A. Herbert, he now deals with each of the sixty-four *exempla* separately, mentioning probable sources and other well-known medieval collections in which they occur. The outstanding debt to Gregory's *Dialogues* thus receives fresh emphasis. M. Arnould, however, is wrong in stating (p. 141) that the present reviewer was guilty of linking the history of the familiar tale of the Devil riding on the lady's train with the legend of the *Caudatus Anglicus* in his *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*. Equally mistaken is his notion that the two stories have no common place in the current denunciation of these feminine enormities. As indicated in the volume referred to, the thirteenth-century Dominican preacher, Étienne de Bourbon, having repeated the first from 'magister Jacobus' (Jacques de Vitry), goes on to declare, in the course of his next paragraph—'Item mirum est quod mulieres non erubescunt esse caudatae, cum Anglici erubescant caudati vocari.'

If its *exempla* seem to rebut the suggestion that the *Manuel* may have been derived from a single earlier source,<sup>1</sup> so also does its doctrinal content. The first five books, which M. Arnould considers the core of the work, draw their plan and much of their substance from the diocesan Constitutions and episcopal ordinances aforementioned. To fill the gaps, their author has made considerable use of the *Somme des Vices* of Peraldus. Book VII likewise appears to owe much to a sermon of the same prolix Dominican. But the treatise as a whole reveals a fresh, discriminating, clarifying, logical choice and arrangement of the available material and at least some originality in its treatment of current English life and manners. Above all, it enjoys the distinction of being 'le premier ouvrage de casuistique vraiment populaire'. The author himself, however, remains as dim and doubtful as ever. William of Waddington may well have come from a hamlet of that name in the West Riding of Yorkshire, near Clitheroe, and been a secular priest; but we do not even know whether he was really responsible for the original version, or only its reviser—or, may be, merely its early scribe. In rejecting the ascription to Bishop Grossetête, M. Arnould is now supported by Professor S. H. Thomson of Colorado,<sup>2</sup> although his statement on p. 250 to the effect that the good prelate addressed himself solely to clergy may need to be modified in view of Anglo-Norman tracts from his pen, which, as Professor Thomson points out, are attempts at popularizing religion. All the available evidence suggests a date c. 1260 for the work.

What the *Manuel* lacked in vividness and variety, with its poor rhymes and monotonous style, was destined to be made good in the native language, after the turn of the century. In his closing chapter M. Arnould deals at some length with three extant English versions, the well-known *Handlyng Synne* of Robert

<sup>1</sup> M. Arnould's discussion of MS. Add. 38654 and its Latin as *singulièrement francisée*, &c., on pp. 190-2, deserves special attention here.

<sup>2</sup> See *The Writings of Robert Grosseteste* (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 253-4.

Mannyng (1303), which, for all its doggerel, has at any rate these merits, a literal prose translation in southern dialect, of about fifty years later (in his reckoning), to be found only in MS. St. John's College, Cambridge, 197, and Peter Idle's fifteenth-century metrical *Instructions to his Son*, the text of which was published in America twelve years ago. Here his remarks on Mannyng's typical pulpit style are particularly worthy of notice. Two Appendixes giving detailed descriptions of all the twenty-three known manuscripts of the *Manuel* and specimens of a critical text, together with a good Bibliography, conclude this most useful, thorough, and interesting study.

The strict limits imposed upon his Introduction naturally preclude Mr. Francis from any equivalent analysis of his fourteenth-century English prose translation of the *Somme des Vices et des Vertus* (or *Somme le Roi*) of Lorens. He may, therefore, have decided not to discuss its subject-matter on the ground that to many it will be sufficiently familiar already in the final volume of an admirable series by Charles-Victor Langlois on French Life in the Middle Ages, which, by the way, he does not mention.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the previous researches of such scholars as Paul Meyer and D. C. Tinbergen permit him to summarize briefly the many bristling problems connected with the sources and variants of the French original. In the absence of any light on the identity of the translator, however, he has very wisely given us an acceptable little sketch of the career of friar Lorens of Orleans himself from all the known records.

Approximately eighty extant manuscripts testify to the immense medieval vogue of the *Somme le Roi*, versions of which survive from this period in Provençal, Catalan, Spanish, Italian, and Flemish, as well as English. Patient scrutiny of other didactic hand-books, quite apart from actual sermons, will often reveal the same influence, as in the case of *Le Ménagier de Paris* overlooked by the late Professor Eileen Power and her predecessors.<sup>2</sup> For England its value was obvious from the fact that it dealt fully with the programme of religious instruction prescribed by the Lambeth Constitutions of 1281, with the exception of the seven Sacraments, which are mentioned but not expounded. Hence, it is not surprising to find evidence of at least nine English translations of the book, in part or in whole, from the *Ayenbite of Inweyt* in 1340 to Caxton's *Royal Book* completed in 1484, eight of which are briefly described by our editor, along with a kindred *Disce Mori*, before he turns to consider the three manuscripts of his own particular Midland version, their language and relationship. The *Somme* itself, like the *Manuel*, a composite tract, would seem to show even less originality than the latter, at all events in respect to at least one-third of its total contents. As Mr. Francis puts it, somewhat generously: 'To his own long treatise on the Seven Gifts and the Virtues he [Lorens] added a few short borrowed pieces, to give his work the completeness which perhaps was part of the king's stipulation.' Now that that work has been made available in easy Middle English, let us trust that many, hitherto discouraged by the difficulties of the *Ayenbite*, will find that it is not so tedious as Professor Schofield of Harvard once supposed. For it is full of lively, picturesque touches.

<sup>1</sup> *La Vie spirituelle* (Paris, 1928), pp. 123-98.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. here my *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England*, p. 596.

Space allows only two further comments. In the present reviewer's judgement Tinbergen's argument from the miniatures of the Apocalyptic Beast (p. xxvi) should be revived with extreme caution. Such marginal pictures so frequently display the illuminator's light-hearted indifference to his text, as well as the innate traditionalism of his art, and a familiar analogue of this very kind—at a time, moreover, when the vogue of the illustrated Apocalypse was, in fact, at its height<sup>1</sup>—would naturally commend itself to him. Monsters, too, are always more exciting than trees! Finally, with regard to the interpolated Wycliffite (?) tract on the Decalogue, which occurs in the Simeon MS. and is here printed in an Appendix, we may hope to know more shortly from researches now being pursued in America by Dr. Donald Lloyd of Oberlin College, who is examining the whole group with a view to determining, once for all, the vexed questions of orthodoxy and authorship.

G. R. OWST

**An Interpretation of the Moral Play, *Mankind*.** By SISTER MARY PHILIPPA COOGAN. Pp. ix+129. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. No price given.

Sister Coogan refers to this work as the first of a series of close studies of the English Moral Plays designed to determine 'what manner of thing the moral play really is', and so to provide a sounder basis than exists at present for the generalizations of the historian. She has certainly shown that *Mankind* provides plenty of material for such an introductory study.

Her interpretation rests on two propositions: (a) that Mercy, the single-handed power for good in the play, is presented by the dramatist in the character of the good priest; and (b) that the play is a Shrovetide piece in which Lenten gravity wins the day over carnival levity. To *Mankind*, Mercy is 'my fadyr Mercy', and Mercy describes himself as 'I Mercy, his father gostly'. The way is thus open to Sister Coogan to illustrate from the text the relations of the father-confessor and guide to his spiritual son, in the light of the teaching of Holy Church on Shrovetide and shrift in a play of Shrovetide provenance.

Shrovetide marked the end of the Christmas season. Old Christmas then abdicated in a last bout of revelry. In 1443 at Norwich, 'in the last end of Cristemesse, viz.: Fastyngonge Tuesday', John Gladman, crowned as King of Christmas, rode in procession followed by Lenton and others 'makyng myrth, disporte and plays'. To this reference by Sister Coogan may be added two others. (1) A fragment of a Shrovetide play, printed by William Rastell (1533), and published by its owner, Dr. Ray Nash (*S.P.*, Oct. 1944), shows the banishment of Riot, Gluttony, Hasarder, and Perjury to the 'newe founde land' by order of Old Christmas and Good Order, the play closing with an exhortation or epilogue addressed by Prayer to the audience to cultivate 'mental prayer . . . this lent tyme'. (2) That Shrovetide plays survived the Reformation appears from the Malone Society's edition of *The Christmas Prince* (ed. Boas and Greg),

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Dr. M. R. James's Schweich Lectures on *The Apocalypse in Art* London, for the Brit. Acad., 1931), *passim*.



an account with texts of the Christmas revels at St. John's College, Oxford, in 1607. In this most interesting record, the Prince is shown 'in a plain scholar's gown' as chief mourner at the burial of his regalia on 13 February after the performance of the Shrove Tuesday play.

That *Mankind*, too, is a Shrovetide play was the conclusion reached by W. K. Smart in 1916 after a thorough examination of the local and topical references characteristic of this play, one of which—the reference to the brief exile of Edward IV in Bruges—contained in the line, 'Anno regni regis nulli' (l. 686) suggested to Smart a precise Shrove Tuesday, viz. 26 February 1471.

Smart had shrewdly detected that *Mankind*'s badge or motto, the *aide-mémoire* that he adopted after his first colloquy with Mercy, was an *excise* from the office of the Imposition of the Ashes on Ash Wednesday: 'Memento homo quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris' (l. 314). As Sister Coogan has drawn attention to a number of similar citations from this and other offices of the early Lenten season she is, I think, justified in accepting Smart's ascription as a working hypothesis for further inquiries.

In her second chapter she examines the serious side of the play under the title 'The Lenten Theme', illustrating its 'doctrine' by reference to the homiletic teaching of Holy Church set out in the collections of medieval sermons which the work of Professor Owst has made familiar. From the liturgical echoes, therefore, of her first chapter the reader passes to homiletic analogues, and, in particular, is introduced to the remarkable parallels found in the collection entitled *Jacob's Well* (E.E.T.S. 115), parallels which, while not precisely 'sources', show that the moral play and the homily or sermon are but two different ways of achieving the same object. The moral play and the sermon are linked, therefore, just as the earlier Easter and Christmas plays were related to the Liturgy and the Office of Mattins.

It is in her third chapter that Sister Coogan—under the title of 'The Allegory'—introduces us to Titivillus, Mischief and the three 'sympull wrechys', Newguise, Nowadays, and Nought. They are the World and the Devil; the third member of the triumvirate—the Flesh—is incorporate in Mankind himself. Of course, as Sister Coogan insists, they are as essential to the allegory as Mercy and Mankind; they correspond to the *exempla* in the triple division of the typical sermon—homily, exemplum, and application. Newguise and Nowadays are indistinguishable, up-to-date ne'er-do-weels; Nought is the best of the trio, a buffoon, usually unlucky, who can pipe in Titivillus on a Walsingham whistle before the collection is taken, start a dirty three-man 'Christmas' song, or fall off the narrow stage in a 'scuttling' dance. He is the boon companion of the common tapster of Bury St. Edmunds. Mischief is the really subtle conception. He represents all evil consequences, and particularly the fatal event. The words *bonchef*—now lost—and *mischief* implied the good ending and the bad. It is Mischief who provides Mankind with the rope to hang himself, just as Mischief hands the knife to Magnificence in Skelton's play. He is in the play both the antagonist and negation of Mercy. He and Mercy, meeting as strangers, style each other 'brother' and the bad three call him 'master'. Mercy and he are the first characters to be introduced to the audience, and Mischief 'argues' with

Mercy. Hitherto the commentators have underrated Mischief. He represents the sin of Judas as St. Jerome saw it: 'Judas trespassyd more whan he hynged hymself thanne whanne he betrayed crist' (*Jacob's Well*, p. 113).

I have, I hope, said enough to show that I am grateful to Sister Coogan for the enjoyment I have derived from her most able and lucid dissertation. I would only point out that A. W. Pollard's last references to this play are those given in the Seventh Edition of his *English Miracle Plays*, 1923.

A. W. REED

**Christopher Marlowe. A Study of his Thought, Learning, and Character.**

By PAUL H. KOCHER. Pp. x+344. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946; London, Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$3.50; 20s. net.

A book on the thought of Christopher Marlowe is one for which there has long been room; indeed it is surprising that none has been written before. For Marlowe is one of those rare poets in whom ideas are matter of passion, and passions translate themselves into ideas without destroying sensitivity; senses, intellect, and imagination are fused together by their own intense power. This, which is revealed in every aspect of his art, down to the details of his imagery, is so rare a phenomenon, at least in English poetry, that it constitutes a challenge to every critic concerned with fundamental aesthetics.

The challenge is in part met by Paul Kocher's book, and seems, from his admirable introductory chapters, to have been met more fully in his intention. He perceives clearly those features of Marlowe's mind which are most significant to those who know him best: the clarity of his thought and the ruthless logic of its processes; the unflinching spiritual courage with which he followed out the implications of his conclusions and reached his ultimate positions; the defiant negation of his attitude to religion, the instinct for which was the strongest of his strong passions; the impatience and the scorn with which he treated intellectual cowardice; the ice-cold irony in which his contempt is usually expressed; the limitation, gradually diminishing, of his human sympathy; the passionate warmth of his response, also within limits, to a few aspects of physical beauty; all the characteristics which make the man revealed in the plays and poems consistent with the facts known of his life, with the comments (understandably prejudiced) made by his contemporaries, and with the meagre records of his conversation. All the characteristics, in fact, which make him by nature less a dramatist than a philosophic, lyric, or narrative poet and his successful incursion into drama one of the notable paradoxes in the history of that art.

Here are certain fundamental problems to be faced: first, the problem that always confronts the spiritual biographer, the synthesis of the personality; second, an interrelated group of problems peculiar to Marlowe, springing from the essential nature of his religious experience; third, the profound problem in dramatic aesthetics (mentioned above) which is, after all, at bottom psychological.

The third of these Kocher does not tackle directly; he appears to consider it (I think mistakenly) irrelevant to the central problems of Marlowe's nature,

though he speaks judiciously of the subjective element in Marlowe's work and of the growth of his dramatic art. The first and second he treats at some length, though it might be wished that he had pushed his thought a little farther in both cases.

His central theme is sound, the importance of Marlowe's preoccupation with religion. This he substantiates most usefully by a careful examination of the theological comments in Marlowe's work, making clear the solidity of his theological scholarship, which has often been recognized, but never before so firmly established; making it, moreover, stand out in still clearer definition by a further examination of his attainments in other fields of learning (astronomy, the literature of witchcraft, political thought) in all of which Marlowe falls short of that exact and searching scholarship that characterizes his divinity. Certain subsidiary characteristics of his mind are also analysed and there are some original comments on his satire, to which less than justice has hitherto been done, on the hard egotism which has been too often glossed over, on the fine sense of form in detail which has sometimes been lost to sight by critics concerned mainly with the relative weakness of Marlowe's sense of form on the grand scale.

Kocher's readers will appreciate keenly the sound learning and clear thinking that has gone into certain parts of the work, notably the full and fruitful commentary on the Baines note, for which all scholars concerned are under a considerable debt to him, but we might perhaps wish that he had shown corresponding boldness in one or two more speculative matters, principally in the chapters on *Faustus* and on witchcraft (5 and 7) and in the synthesis in Chapter 13. Marlowe was not only an acute theologian, a clear, ruthless, and courageous agnostic, but a man to whom religion was more than a preoccupation, to whom it was the central and significant passion of a passionate life, to whom the supreme tragedy of life springs (as does the supreme tragic achievement of his art) from the thought behind Mephistopheles' lines, 'Thinkest thou that I, that saw the face of God . . .'. *Faustus* is one of the great religious dramas of the world's history, perhaps the only one in which tragedy is achieved in terms of religious experience. More lies behind the writing of such a play than theological learning and ruthless agnostic dialectic. But this is only to say that certain major problems proposed to the author by his theme might have been pursued farther (as might also one or two more specific matters such as the function of Faustus's practice of magic and the question why Marlowe's imagination should have been content with this as a symbol of mortal sin). In much of the book, the introductory chapters, those on *Tamburlaine*, *The Jew of Malta*, Witchcraft, Politics, and Ethics, there is a wealth of instruction and suggestion.

The writing throughout is clear and sane; the style is lucid and sometimes more than that, possessed of a cogency, a penetration, that reveals in a few words that understanding of a poet's quality that can only come with long study and deep, imaginative sympathy. Many such comments could be quoted. Some of the best, as might be expected, are those on Marlowe's irony and humour. It is 'trenchant, bawdy and sardonic' (p. 26); 'a carnival of acrid wit' (p. 289); with 'its egoistic, mordant and malignant quality' (p. 291); 'a savage, gladiatorial joy' (p. 298). 'Marlowe's humour enters into its kingdom, but it is not the kingdom

of heaven' (p. 279). Equally good are some of the summaries of the personality itself, which has 'a dark intransigence' (p. 309), and 'seems homesick for evil' (p. 209). In an earlier chapter, 'Affirmation is the pith of his character' (p. 12). But on another side 'the contemplation of the ordered beauty of the stars fed his intellect and enlarged his vision' (p. 213) with 'the exaltation of high intercourse' (p. 240), and in *Hero and Leander* 'there are no rancours in the vessel of his peace' (p. 294). Sometimes the comments are on his art. Marlowe's imagery resulted from 'the pressure of an inevitable fecundity' (p. 239); 'the sweep and oceanic roar of his blank verse' (p. 185) sustains him, and in his picture of Tamburlaine's life 'its magnificence was its goodness' (p. 93).

It is these and the like passages, illuminating the essential nature of Marlowe's character, which combine with the soundness and consistency of his general argument to confer upon the author an indubitable right to speak and to be heard.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR

**As They Liked It: an Essay on Shakespeare and Morality.** By ALFRED HARBAGE. Pp. xvi+238. New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan, 1947. 14s. net.

There is a fair amount of good sense in this book, but it throws little new light on its subject. Professor Harbage's central idea is 'that Shakespeare's plays are designed to exercise but not to alter our moral notions, to stimulate but not to disturb, to provide at once pleasurable excitement and pleasurable reassurance' (p. xii), and it may readily be allowed that he succeeds in establishing this, or at least does not destroy the belief in it that the reader is likely to have had already. The superficiality of his treatment comes out in the remark that Shakespeare 'found his way quickly and stayed with it to the end, growing in power and technical skill but changing little in his basic attitudes' (ibid.). Everything in Shakespeare that eludes this rough-and-ready antithesis between technique and attitude escapes unobserved, until, to take an extreme instance, we are told that 'Solinus is a better example than Angelo of Shakespeare's methods in comedy' (p. 135).

It is natural that the author should be at his best where what is needed is a deflation of the over-subtle. Thus there are some sensible pages on the critics who go too far in expounding Shakespeare 'in terms of Elizabethan science and philosophy' (p. 33), with special reference to Lily Campbell on *Hamlet*. And here and there throughout the book are neat and perceptive comments, as that Shakespeare 'satisfies a man like Johnson because, although not a moralist he is moral; and he satisfies a man like Hazlitt because, although moral, he is not a moralist' (p. 45), or that 'Falstaff's outer vices divert our attention from his inner vice, the lack of principles, at the same time that this inner vice nullifies the outer vices' (p. 75). The chapters on 'justice' in the various types of play add nothing, in essence, to Johnson's classic discussion in his *Preface* of the plays as 'compositions of a distinct kind', but there is some value in the line drawn between fable, where 'the events have no final authority in determining the

dramatist's version of them' (p. 124) and history (including the three Roman plays, and *Troilus and Cressida*, as well as the English histories). It is suggested that fable 'represents elliptically the whole of existence' and history only 'a segment of existence' (p. 158).

If there is little in the book that provokes vehement disagreement, it is chiefly because there is little that provokes any vehement reaction at all. One of the few misprints produces the pleasing line: As surfeit is the father of much fat. The robust obviousness of this reading is so much in keeping with the spirit of the work as almost to tempt one to regard it as an emendation. J. C. MAXWELL

**The Crown of Life.** By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Pp. viii+336. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. 18s. net.

**The Golden World of 'King Lear'.** By GEOFFREY L. BICKERSTETH. Pp. 27 (Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy). London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1946. 3s. net.

*The Crown of Life* contains six 'Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Final Plays', and is, the author tells us, 'the culmination of twenty years' work on Shakespeare'. The first essay, 'Myth and Miracle', is, indeed, a reprint of Mr. Wilson Knight's 'first published statement', and belongs to 1929. The essays which follow are recent, and the book thus provides an opportunity of judging both how constant Mr. Wilson Knight has been to his original assertions and in what directions he has been led by them. 'My method is', he wrote in 1929, 'to regard the plays as they stand in the order to which modern scholarship has assigned them; to refuse to regard "sources" as exerting any limit to the significance of the completed work of art; to avoid the side-issues of Elizabethan and Jacobean manners, politics, patronage, audiences, revolutions and explorations; to fix attention solely on the poetic quality and human interest of the plays concerned' (p. 9). 'Myth and Miracle' ended with the claim that its conclusions on the meaning of the Final Plays were 'set beyond the hostile comment of the expert on contemporary history, the tracer of "sources", and the critic who must ever think in terms of Shakespeare's "intentions"' (p. 29).

When Mr. Wilson Knight's conclusions are expressed in general terms it is indeed difficult to quarrel with them. He says that *The Tempest* is 'at the same time a record of Shakespeare's spiritual progress and a statement of the vision to which that progress has brought him' (p. 27), and we cannot dispute a claim which only grants to the author of *Hamlet* and *King Lear* what is granted without question to the authors of *Paradise Regained*, *The Prelude*, and *Hyperion*. But the faults of these essays appear in the detailed application of this thesis. Thus Mr. Wilson Knight's method enables him not only to regard as irrelevant any books that Shakespeare might conceivably have read, but to deal at some length with several books which Shakespeare could not possibly have read and which for that very reason are regarded as relevant. Mr. Arthur Waley's translation of a sixteenth-century Chinese novel is used to illuminate the symbolism of Ariel, Caliban, and Prospero. The reason given for the comparison is that 'the human



imagination finds expression not only through accepted thought-forms of legend and history but also through a hierarchy of semi-esoteric symbols, drawn mainly from natural phenomena, with strangely consistent meanings throughout the centuries and across the globe' (p. 226).

The hypnotic repetition of details, citations of words, phrases, and images, cannot in fact conceal the underlying vagueness of Mr. Wilson Knight's thought. In order to prove that in *The Tempest* Shakespeare 'outlined, among much else, a myth of the national soul', he asks us to imagine 'an enlightened historian' ten thousand years hence, who should attempt to assess Great Britain's 'contribution'. We wonder whether this imaginary scholar is not to be useful mainly because of the *generality* we can naturally assume in his knowledge, and we are not surprised that, when he has made his survey of English history, 'little ingenuity is needed to find correspondences with Prospero, Ariel and Caliban' (p. 255). Mr. Wilson Knight has, of course, that ingenuity, and he has used it frequently in this book to exalt 'Britain's destiny' (a significant addition to his original programme). Thus 'the pattern in *Cymbeline* is very clear. The banished Britisher was from the start thrown among dangerous foreigners. . . . The simple islander is in danger of moral ruin. . . . Remembering Imogen's royal birth, we can say that Posthumus defends not merely a single lady, but Britain's soul-integrity widely conceived, among foreigners who cannot understand his idealism and resent its implications' (p. 145).

Similar preoccupations lead Mr. Wilson Knight to argue for the Shakespearian authorship of *Henry VIII* as a whole. He maintains that the 'non-Shakespearian' verse and rhetoric in it is used by Shakespeare throughout the play for the theme of conversion and renunciation. But Mr. Wilson Knight does not prove his case; he only says that he could prove it if he were not concerned with more important things. 'A complete defence would demand a treatment at least as long as that to be devoted here to a pure interpretation' (p. 271). He tries to reassure us, and himself, by saying that his interpretation would be 'substantially no less true' if multiple authorship were proved. The truth is that Mr. Wilson Knight uses his undoubted gift of imagination at the expense of other qualities, without which it loses most of its value.

Professor Bickersteth's lecture on *King Lear* deals with the central mystery of tragedy: why should the representation of suffering and death give us pleasure and seem to purify our emotions? His argument has the interest that this subject will always yield when it is handled by a generous and lucid mind.

F. T. PRINCE

**Apologie for Bartholomew Fayre: The Art of Jonson's Comedies.** By FREDA L. TOWNSEND. Pp. x+101. New York: The Modern Language Association of America; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. 15s. net.

'The classical Jonson', says Miss Townsend, 'is a figment of critical imaginations', which has deluded everybody for three centuries. From Dryden to C. H.



Herford the misreading is continuous. So she takes a new measure of Jonson's art and finds in it a complexity and profusion foreign to the ancient standards. But, as she admits on p. 92, these short-sighted critics 'all point out, at some time or other in his dramatic career, moments when classical example was flung to the winds', so her standpoint is evidently not so original as she supposes.

Moreover, Jonson shared the delusion of his critics. In the memorable preface to *Hymenaei*—a passage which Miss Townsend does not quote among the hundreds of citations and references with which she packs her pages—he put forward as his ideal of writing 'high and hearty inventions . . . grounded upon antiquity and solid learning'. True, he referred to masques, but he would have wished the description to cover the range of his art. Defining his attitude to the classics in another passage which Miss Townsend has overlooked, he claimed for himself the freedom of the artist: 'I know nothing can conduce more to letters than to examine the writings of the Ancients, and not to rest in their sole authority or take all upon trust from them. . . . For to all the observations of the Ancients we have our own experience, which if we will use and apply, we have better means to pronounce' (*Discoveries*, 129–37). In Herford's words Jonson was 'never a servile classicist' (*Ben Jonson*, i. 290), and though she quotes comment after comment of Herford's on deviations from the classical norm, usually in a way that suggests attack, Miss Townsend omits this clear preliminary statement. Actually Herford anticipated a number of the points which this book endeavours to press home, but he is always quoted in a form which suggests that his utterances are hopelessly contradictory.

Jonson learned from a keen study of the classics two lessons which powerfully influenced his work—the need of careful plot-construction and a sense of style. For the former he followed the Renaissance critics. Thus he accepted Scaliger's fourfold division of a play—*protasis* or introduction; *epitasis* or a working up of the plot; *catastasis* or counterturn, as Dryden defined it, 'imbroiling the action in new difficulties'; and *catastrophe* or dénouement. He enumerated these in the first chorus of *The Magnetic Lady*—another passage which Miss Townsend has neglected, though she quotes on p. 94 his comparison of a good play to a skein of silk which can be unravelled only if you take it by the right end. This classical framework was wide enough or elastic enough to admit of underplots, of a crowded stage, and of the closest interplay of character with character; Dryden praised Jonson for the 'copiousness and well-knitting of his intrigues'.

The one new point in Miss Townsend's interpretation is her discovery that *Bartholomew Fair* is the 'culmination of Jonson's comic art', a greater play than *Volpone* or *The Alchemist* because of its disregard of classical structure. This was determined by the nature of the play. 'The petty traffic of the Fair', Herford pointed out, 'did not admit the intensity and complexity of dramatic effect he had educed from the grandiose operations of the Fox and the Alchemist'; there is 'no hero, no dominant character, no well-defined unity of plot'. None the less the 'shaping and contriving hand has not been less active', though less obtrusive and more subtle in its operations (*Ben Jonson*, ii. 137–8). To Miss Townsend this is a dilemma; Herford might be expected to be capable of supposing that workmanship other than classical could never be careful. He ought not to have

suggested that there was anything artistic in the play, and then he would have fallen a readier prey to Miss Townsend.

Fortunately her last chapter, 'The Line and the Loom', contains more sensible criticism than this. She speculates how Jonson would have written his 'Apology for Bartholomew Fair', and these few pages suggest that she is capable of better work than this perverse and unbalanced book.

PERCY SIMPSON

**Poems. By Richard Leigh. 1675.** Reprinted with an introduction by HUGH MACDONALD. Pp. xx+80. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947. 7s. 6d. net.

A few of Richard Leigh's poems have become known through recent anthologies, but the rest have never been reprinted since 1675. In his introduction Mr. Macdonald has gathered what can be discovered about the author. On a few points only he might have said more. At Walsall Grammar School Leigh would have had as his exact contemporaries the future Lord Chancellor Somers and John Hough, the famous President of Magdalen. The poems addressed to Archbishop Sheldon at the beginning and end of the book and the long poem on the Sheldonian Theatre are probably due to Sheldon having been Chancellor of Oxford when Leigh was at the Queen's College and to the theatre being in course of building all through his undergraduate years and opened in the summer that he took his bachelor's degree. John Evelyn tells how Wren showed him the model in 1664 when the foundations were just laid, and describes the brilliant scene at the opening in July 1669. No recent building in Oxford had stirred so much excitement, and Leigh pays his tribute to Wren, 'so wise an *Architect*' (unfortunately printed here 'wife').

Two years before publishing his *Poems* in 1675 Richard Leigh had written *The Censura of the Rota*, a bantering attack on *The Conquest of Granada*. Dryden retaliated by dubbing him 'the Fastidious Brisk of Oxford'; Burton had already used this phrase to describe 'a yong gallant . . . that can wear his cloathes well in fashion'. Leigh wrote also in that year *The Transposer Rehearsed*, taking the side of Samuel Parker ('Mr. Bayes') in the long duel with Marvell. The *Poems* are fortunately free from controversy, for which Leigh had no special talent. In a disarming preface he allows that as for the complimentary verses 'He has not the Vanity to think [them] longer-liv'd, then Monethly Flowers, which look gay, for a little Season, and please, but while they are fresh and keep their Scent'. They are not, however, quite without interest even now, for example, when he addresses the archbishop, now in his seventy-seventh year: 'So you, to whom *old Age* unknown appears, Seem yong, with the increase of *many years*.' But it is in the short lyrics that he excels. He can prettily describe tulips of varied hues, peach-gathering, a lady playing with a squirrel on her shoulder, and the birds seen from the bedroom window when the curtains are drawn at daybreak. As Mr. Macdonald observes: 'He is particularly interested in the physics of sight and hearing.' Echoes and remote sounds always appeal to him. He plays happily with the notion of the air, which, 'nor *Treble, Mean, nor Base*', is yet used to

make such different sounds; it breathes in the flute, through the horn 'turns to a hoarser Voice', is 'shrill in Trumpets', and 'dwindles to a feeble Base' in the bagpipes. In 'Looking through a Perspective' he writes:

*One Eye consents to lose,  
But does that loss requite  
With th' other Eyes delight.  
Which doubling thus its Raies,  
Its borrow'd Beams repayes.*

He marvels that the same winter day has such contrary effects that it 'drops Snow so soft, and hardens Ice'. There is an engaging freshness about his fancies, which makes his poems welcome; there is nothing quite like them.

F. E. HUTCHINSON

[This review was written shortly before Dr. Hutchinson's death. He did not live to correct the proofs.—*Ed.*]

**A Bibliography of the Theophrastan Character in English, with several Portrait Characters.** By CHESTER NOYES GREENOUGH. Prepared for Publication by J. MILTON FRENCH. Pp. xii + 347 (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, XVIII). Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947. \$10.00; 55s. net.

The material for this book was collected by the late Professor Greenough, who was still adding to it at the time of his death. It has now been brought out by his friend Mr. Milton French, who in his short introduction shows that he is well aware of the shortcomings inherent in a posthumous volume. Loyally as Mr. French has performed his difficult task the reader frequently feels that gaps have been left which were to have been filled, and that jottings which had been made as a reminder that further investigation was required have been included as if they were meant to be printed. As originally planned this bibliography was to be an appendix to a history of the character, a subject which had interested Professor Greenough for many years. That history is now being written by Professor Benjamin Boyce. But the bibliography was nearing completion and it is so comprehensive that it has rightly been published as an independent book. It raises, however, some questions. It is a question, for instance, if a bibliography of the Theophrastan character is the better for including several 'portrait characters'—word-pictures of notable men by their contemporaries. The two types may be combined, as in Samuel Butler's 'The Duke of Bucks', but the number of portrait characters is so large that the bibliographer must choose one type or another unless his work is to become unwieldy. There is the further question—what is a character? In this bibliography the entries, which are in chronological order from 1495 to 1941, include books as different as Ascham's *The Scholemaster* and Milton's *Poems* of 1645. The first is a character-book only by a very liberal interpretation of the term, and to label 'L'Allegro' 'the cheerful man' and 'Il Penseroso' 'the melancholy man' and thus rank them as 'Theophrastan characters' is to stretch the term rather far. No doubt it is well to be

reminded of the many forms the character takes, and of the difficulty in defining its limits. A minor question of technique is the advisability of repeating an entry under each year of republication. The Marquis of Halifax's *The Lady's New Years Gift*, for instance, is entered every year in which it was reprinted—so far as the information was available to Professor Greenough—between 1688 and 1934. Nothing is gained by citing the *C.B.E.L.* as the authority for Katherine Philips's authorship of *Poems By The Incomparable K.P.*, 1664, or for Marvell's authorship of 'The Character of Holland' which is printed in his *Poems*, 1681. Such references as these look like casual jottings. On the other hand there is an omission which cannot be so easily explained if 'portrait-characters' were to be introduced at all. Clarendon's *History* is not given a main entry but appears only as having provided extracts used by other writers. If the indexes are to be trusted (and no flaw has been found in them on several testings) the first mention of Clarendon is in the description of White Kennet's *History of England*, 1706. Sir Philip Warwick was a good hand at drawing characters: he has an entry to himself, but others equally good are not given a place.

Anyone who has compiled an extensive bibliography will know how difficult it is to make a satisfactory job of the first edition, and a reviewer is bound to seem ungracious if he calls attention to defects rather than to merits. Moreover, the war added to the difficulty of the task, for, as Mr. French says, many of the books given can be seen only in England. To a considerable extent reliance had to be placed on entries in the Stationers' Registers, Sale Catalogues, and similar sources of information. Notwithstanding some shortcomings this is a valuable reference book, and it is indispensable to all those interested in the kinds of literature it covers, particularly because of the large number of little-known books and pamphlets which are included. It will be a permanent memorial to an honoured teacher in a great American University.

HUGH MACDONALD

**Dr. Campbell's Diary of a Visit to England in 1775.** Edited by JAMES L. CLIFFORD. Pp. xvi + 148. Cambridge: University Press, 1947. 8s. 6d. net.

Thomas Campbell, an Irish parson, is known to readers of Boswell, and has his niche in *D.N.B.* His diary first saw the light in 1854, when it was published by the Prothonotary of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, who had found it in his office. A copy was sent to Macaulay, whom it interested: 'It by no means gives the notion of a blind fanatical worshipper of Johnson, as I had supposed Campbell to be from Boswell's narrative'. Reeve asked Macaulay to review the book in the *Edinburgh*. He did not care to do this; but he did correspond with the editor of the diary, and by tracing the manuscript from Ireland to the Antipodes established its authenticity, which has been questioned. All this we learn from an introduction by Mr. S. C. Roberts, who has had access to Macaulay's unpublished journals now at Trinity. Mr. Roberts was minded to re-edit the book, but saw that this would not do, unless the manuscript could be found; for the first editor (like the first editor of Boswell's letters to Temple—indeed like

almost all nineteenth-century editors) had bowdlerized his text—just when it reached Fleet Street and became exciting. He sometimes also misread Campbell's handwriting. From Mr. Roberts the torch of aspiration passed to Professor Clifford, whose pertinacity is known to his friends. 'Undaunted by preliminary discouragement, he persisted'; and at last the librarian of the Mitchell Library in Sydney ran the truant MS. to earth. Mr. Clifford now presents it *verbatim* in some 70 pages, to which he prefixes a life of Campbell and appends ample notes. Though Campbell's diary is, as Mr. Roberts remarks, 'small beer' for a Macaulay, it is eminently readable, and not devoid of edification. The writer had many of the qualities that make a diarist: shrewdness, good humour, lively curiosity. But his journal would hardly have been published, let alone remembered and republished, if it did not contain some twenty pages of *Johnsoniana*, on which all editors for near a century have drawn. It is to be feared that the spot-light will now be concentrated on a single passage, one which may be read as showing that Johnson was capable of swearing and even of bawdy. There are two anecdotes, and they are found, with variations, in Boswell's and Campbell's journals. The time, 1 April 1775; the place, Thrale's dinner-table. In one of the anecdotes Campbell makes Johnson say 'Damn the rascal'; Boswell records no such expletive. The other is more serious; it is Johnson's answer, made notorious by the publication of Boswell's journal, to the question, what is the greatest pleasure? Note that Boswell and Campbell were present on 1 April, Johnson and Garrick were not. The story was told by Arthur Murphy, not the most accurate of Irishmen, on the authority of Garrick, whose profession is not calculated to promote accuracy. No one seems to have asked, at the time, *when* Johnson used the words attributed to him. Now Garrick had known him from boyhood. One reviewer has hinted that Mr. Clifford is here guilty of whitewashing. But he is surely right to point out that the evidence is shaky, and that, even if we accept it, the question of date is all-important. If we could swallow the story whole, and could place it in or near the period in which Johnson is known to have discounted profanity and repressed obscenity, we should have to convict him of the graver vice of hypocrisy. But there is no good reason for swallowing the story whole; and the sense of the dictum, considered apart from its phrasing, is really innocent. Geoffrey Scott himself, if my judgement is not at fault, got this point wrong in his introduction to the volume of Boswell's journals that he called *The Making of the Life*. He seems to me there to confuse obscenity with Rabelaisian talk.

Mr. Clifford's notes, full, learned, and acute as they are, yet leave something for the gleaner. Campbell tells (p. 49) a story of a 'virtuoso' who exposed himself to ridicule: 'describing the device on a Snuff box he pointed out a satyr blowing his concha'. We might have been told that a satyr is a terrestrial monster, and that it is the triton who blows his conch. P. 53, the newspaper attacks on Johnson for his 'abuse' of Scotland. Mr. Clifford might have suggested that some of these may well have been instigated by Macpherson, who was powerful with the press. P. 63, we might have been told that the 'mean looking' Lyttelton was the Bad not the Good Lord L. P. 70, Campbell heard a bishop preach 'on these two commandments &c.', seeking 'to prove that piety and virtue went hand in hand'.



Mr. Clifford is content to quote his predecessor's note: 'possibly the first two commandments'. But the bishop was not preaching against polytheism and idolatry. The reference is clearly to the gospels, e.g. Matthew xxii. 40, where Campbell's actual words 'these two commandments' occur.

The book is admirably printed. But, Mr. Roberts, but, Mr. Crutchley, Campbell heads most entries e.g. '15th', and since the headline is wasted in vain reiteration, 'Dr. Campbell's Diary', the reader must turn back to learn that it is March.

R. W. CHAPMAN

**The Nascent Mind of Shelley.** By A. M. D. HUGHES. Pp. vii+272. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. 15s. net.

This is not simply a research study devoted to the exhaustive discussion of one period of Shelley's life; the book sets out 'to demonstrate the high degree of continuity in Shelley's main ideas and the relevance to his poetry of their worth and weight'. Professor Hughes, whose first authoritative writings on Shelley appeared in 1912, is here giving us some of the fruits of his long and profound study of the poet, and what he has to say is of more than temporary or marginal significance.

Of the book's fifteen chapters, eight are chiefly biographical, the rest wholly analytical. The account of Shelley's life stops short at the publication, in his twentieth year, of *Queen Mab*—not arbitrarily, but because it is his formative years, and the foundation of his thought, that are here given fullest treatment, and the biography is designed to 'give the background of the novels, pamphlets, or poems, and to make out the moral essence'. Indeed it deserves by its fullness, sympathy, and swift narrative zest to replace all other accounts of the early years. This will no doubt happen unless the trenchant independence of Professor Hughes's reading of events should alarm those in search of a non-committal handling. For he offers not merely the facts but a closely reasoned commentary on them, and each phase of Shelley's mental growth is weightily discussed. We read, for instance, how the Power and Love of Browning's essay dominated his infantile studies and dreams, the one sought in all manifestations of the infinite and marvellous, the other in union with an entirely sympathetic fellow being; how the compelling experience 'which burst My spirit's sleep' came when his mind was prepared for it by Love, by advancing intellectual powers, and by the increasing sense of alienation from a repressive and selfish environment; how the first marriage was made possible by desperation at the loss of Harriet Grove, first deflected and later exasperated by the dangerously unbalanced desire for a vicarious union, through Hogg, with Elizabeth. In all these conclusions the logic and insight seem unassailable. Yet it is possible that not all the links in Professor Hughes's narrative will be generally accepted. Some will find Hogg's brilliant and faithless chapters rated here a little too high, for Hogg was ill-equipped emotionally for his task. To say that 'the freedom of the two volumes of 1858' offended Sir Percy and Lady Shelley is to be over-kind to Hogg: what offended them was not freedom (as *Letters About Shelley* makes plain) but spite.



Doubters may compare the accounts by Hogg and Peacock of the elephantiasis-fantasy. Again, two of Shelley's own stories of his youth—of Lind's intervention to save him from the madhouse, and of the two expulsions from Eton—not everywhere valid currency, are here exchanged in good faith. Not that Professor Hughes is unduly trustful. He lays the engineering of the first marriage at Eliza's door, and heads his account of the events preceding it 'The Plot Is Laid'.

But the book's triumph is in sensitive and detailed analysis. The characters of those who by personal influence moulded Shelley's mind are each described with a pen as vivid as Hogg's, and a mind clearer than his; and the early writings are illuminated and weighed in the smallest particular. A remarkable continuity emerges, for nothing was ever lost that Shelley once possessed or was possessed by. His childish fancies, Gothic and scientific alike, appear in his highest poetry essentially unchanged. Both Godwin and Plato had touched him while still at Eton, and instead of discarding this or that element as he passed through his successive stages, he merely allowed them to shift their balance. The chapter on Godwin should correct the notion that Shelley's thought was at any time a mere copy of his instructor's or even that he dissented in details only. Godwin's philosophy was lacking both in logical completeness and in non-intellectual sympathy with human problems; espoused to reason, he chides passion like a baby, and traverses far too superficially the question of the role of pleasure in the good life. In Shelley's hands these problems are transcended by a lifting of the issue on to the plane of religious experience (we pass 'from pleasure as an end to pleasure unabstracted in the infinite and supreme good'). The two visions, for it was chiefly as a vision that *Political Justice* captured Shelley, had very different foundations. Godwin saw an individualism, a complete independence sanctioned and directed by reason: for Shelley the *primum mobile* was 'a fusing fire where the individual is rapt and lost'. Again, in the burning question of the status of woman, Shelley drew apart. Mary Wollstonecraft, deprecating the passions and claiming (for all her theology) a sober, workaday alliance, could not satisfy him; neither could Lawrence with his wearisome crying up of an 'advanced' promiscuity, though Shelley took some toll of the four clouterly volumes. As he saw it, the woman is part companion, part complement: less active than her mate in voicing and furthering the truth, she has none the less a 'deeper hold' on it. To round off the account of his thinking on practical matters, Professor Hughes, in his chapter 'Shelley and the Age', sketches in the background of political thought from Burke to the ageing Wordsworth, and behind them the dark strain of pessimism, striking in its modernity, when the prophecy of mankind's extinction ran its course from Grainville to Beddoes.

Finally, in the last two chapters, we look ahead to the whole body of Shelley's poetry and its dominating themes and dogmas. First his developing idea of God is traced (he wavered, at the time of *Queen Mab*, between the notion of a purposive and all-pervading spirit working through and around the material world, and Drummond's quasi-Spinozistic view of an all-generating, impersonal 'substance'). Then the recurrent pattern of so many of the poems is uncovered: the Youth seeking for his 'antitype', the perfect love. After its first uncomplicated

statement in *Alastor* it gains a new and tragic episode, the assault of Pandemon on the lover already dizzy from the first draught of the heady cup. *Prince Athanase*, *Una Favola*, *Epipsychidion*, all repeat the tale, and, though not alone, it is markedly among the themes of the *Triumph*. Here are the clear marks of Shelley's own sorrows, and his first marriage is the enemy's most signal victory. Professor Hughes goes on to trace another line of development, in Shelley's handlings of the theme of the exiled soul, and its inheriting of the white radiance that awaits it after death. But this depends on highly personal readings such as his key to the symbolism of the *Witch of Atlas*, in which many of the statements seem such as can neither be affirmed nor denied.

One more comment is needful. The philosophical interpretation of poetry, as a branch of criticism, is losing status, and few would be found to share Professor Hughes's faith that a poem's chief claim to greatness lies in the nourishment it can offer to the philosophic mind (p. 261). But in Shelley's case the justification is to hand. He wrote most of his verse in a state bordering on trance; *A Defence of Poetry*, where it touches on the poet's craft, is a denigration of the intellect and an exaltation of the impulse which blends all the elements of being in an incantatory or phantasmagoric strain. Revision, to him (though he took it seriously) meant no more than allowing his imagination to play on the unfinished work and add fresh jets and spurts of 'inspiration'. The critical intellect was allowed extraordinarily little sway; too little, indeed, for those who like their poetry precise and shapely. Messrs. Barnefield and Carpenter might have helped us more here. Still, though the mental process may be hard to name, its effects are obvious. Thus, and we must insist on it, the critic of Shelley cannot say baldly, 'This was his philosophy, and here he poetized it': rather he must advance to the study of the poetry armed with the fullest available knowledge of the materials, intellectual and actual, which made up what Peacock called Shelley's 'ideas with the force of sensations'. For the more simple and austere pursuit of literary criticism, which underlies all discussion of the merits of Shelley's 'subject matter', cannot get forward until every part of his life and work has been subjected to an examination as close, and a sympathy as keen, as are here at work.

JOHN WAIN

**Keats' Reputation in America to 1848.** By HYDER E. ROLLINS. Pp. 147. (Harvard Keats Memorial Studies I.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1946. \$5; 28s. net.

Professor Hyder E. Rollins's austere and meticulous scholarship needs no advertisement. He has now devoted these qualities to a form of study much practised by American scholars in recent years. Investigations of the 'Reputation' or 'Reception' of a writer in a given place during a given period are, however, dogged by certain unfortunate characteristics, springing, almost inevitably, from the nature of the subject chosen. How difficult it is to give such a study any coherence other than the merely chronological. How difficult to bring out the significance of the theme: to show how critical attitudes to the chosen writer (his

'reputation') are related to current preoccupations about literature, to views about past writing and to quests for new modes; to show what needs this writer satisfies and what preconceptions he violates; to isolate and display, in short, the manner in which his work enters and affects the living river of production and appreciation. How much easier it is to confine the study, to find an edition here, an anthology there, an essay, a review, and to note them down in chronological order.

This, in effect, is what Professor Rollins does. He has prepared the groundwork for, rather than written, a study of the 'Reputation' or 'Reception' of Keats in America during this period. His activities have been prodigious and so is the amount of information he has gathered about forgotten editions and periodicals. To students of literary journalism in America his investigations must prove of considerable value. But the general reader wanders lost among the names—the *Illustrated Monthly Courier*, the *New England Galaxy*, the *American Monthly Magazine*, the *Western Messenger*, and so on. Sometimes individuals and groups about whom one would willingly know more start out for a moment; and it is pleasant to hear something about that sympathetic person George Keats in Louisville, Kentucky, with his eagerness to advance his brother's fame and the pathetic warmth of his response to any interested inquiry. But no shape, no pattern emerges.

Professor Rollins's general contention seems to be that there was greater interest in and appreciation of Keats in America than in England at this time. This may be so; but one wonders whether the criteria adopted for the purposes of the comparison are altogether adequate; and the eulogies of Keats quoted are singularly lacking in critical worth. And, again, the real questions—if they are to be put—are these: to what extent, how, and why were the poems and the image of Keats as poet potent in American culture at this period and in English culture; if the situations in England and America are different, what then exactly are the differences and what produced them? But it must be admitted that labours such as those of Professor Rollins are necessary before such questions can be answered (if they can be answered).

This study is announced as the first of the 'Harvard Keats Memorial Studies' (two versions of the title of the series are offered, one on the dust cover and one on a preliminary leaf). The name of the 'designer' of the book is given so we may record that it is elegantly produced and charmingly illustrated, with really remarkable facsimiles. And perhaps these features account for the ridiculously high price.

D. J. GORDON

**The Journal of Sir Walter Scott, 1829-32.** Edited by J. G. TAIT. Pp. viii+275. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1947. 10s. net.

Scott began his *Journal* for several reasons: partly to leave a record of interesting men and events, partly as a solace to himself, and partly as a spur to keep him up to his daily task on the *Magnum* and *Count Robert of Paris*. He does not bare his soul or explore the depths of his mind in it. When he comes to the edge of the abyss, he says that life could not be endured if we saw it as it really is and passes on. He is always the novelist, and he himself is one of his greatest characters—perhaps his greatest.

In these years, 1829-32, he is near the end of his furrow. He walks as if peas were in his boots. He can only scramble along on his pony. He has one paralytic seizure, or what he fears to be such, then another and another. He tells the same story twice at a dinner. He mis-spells. His hand shakes. But he fags on, refusing to surrender, thanking God for what he still can enjoy—sweet Abbotsford, the terraces at Culross, the poetry of Rob Don the Gaelic poet, a quiet talk on ordinary things with Will Laidlaw, even a dinner with Edward Irving who in appearance seemed to him like Satan disguised as an angel of light.

Lockhart printed large sections of Scott's *Journal* in his *Life of Scott*, but he exercised his right as a biographer to exclude or arrange what did not suit his picture. In 1890 David Douglas, the Edinburgh publisher, brought out a complete version and supplied it with many excellent notes. Some time ago the manuscript was sold to the Trustees of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, and they made a gift of a photostat to the National Library of Scotland. The late John Guthrie Tait, on his retirement to Edinburgh after long service in India, giving much time to the study of Scott, came to the conclusion that a revised text of the *Journal* was needed. A first volume of his edition appeared in 1939 and caused some stir in the literary reviews; a second in 1943; and here is the third (1946), in part collated and edited by Mr. W. M. Parker. Principal Tait died in 1945.

The three volumes, printed on the best of paper and in the best of type, make a handsome book. It is a pity, however, that there is no indication on the title-page that this is Volume III of the work. One might assume from the title and preface that it is an independent publication. Only when one comes to the Index does one encounter the words, Vols. I, II, and III. In spite of this slight flaw in format this is a splendid edition of the great work.

Principal Tait criticized Douglas on two grounds: (1) for omitting a number of passages, and (2) for misinterpreting words and phrases. Here is an example of omission, an angry attack on *Blackwood's*. Douglas gave a sentence from 18 March 1831 where Scott says that *Blackwood's* is now bedaubing Lockhart for his sake; but omitted the main part of the entry, no doubt thinking that to represent Scott as irritably angry, marred his greatness:

'For two or three numbers he has opened his fire, or rather levelled his long gun with a *posse tisé* supposing that I should deprecate further hostilities . . . he be damned. . . . As a politician he puts one in mind of Barm Jock of other days, a kind of blustering idiot whom a mob carried upon their shoulders during a riot rather as their banner than bannerman. But Barm Jock proved before judge and Jury that he was mortal drunk the whole time. Notwithstanding his low propensities John Wilson is a clever fellow. . . .'

Douglas omitted also some reflections on suicide, fearing the shadow of a suspicion that Scott had thought of suicide. 'I am sure it is mere fear keeps half the word (from suicide) especially if they have been blistered, bled and criticized.'

Apart from those two the omissions are of little account—a record of experiments with the mariner's compass, a scornful reference or two to Mr. Knox the anatomist, a frequently repeated reflection that contrary to his father's advice, *hoc age*, he works best by carrying on two trains of thought at once.

An example of misreading is a sentence under 9 May 1829. It evidently reads in the manuscript: 'I have every think to day previous to my going away, but, *que faut il faire?*' Douglas printed: 'I have done everything.' Principal Tait points out rightly that this is contrary to the context and prints: 'I have (left undone) every think (to do) to day previous to my going away.' But such misreadings, in this volume at any rate, are few.

Principal Tait supplied a number of notes, though not so numerous or full as those of the 1890 edition. His enthusiasm was for an exact text in which no illegible word had been left undiscussed. But notes are immensely helpful in a work where so many people cross the stage and where the writer ranges through half a dozen literatures. It would be good if, as the reviewer of Vol. 1 in this *Review* remarked, an edition were published combining the merits of both. Some additional notes might be necessary. What is a *posse tisaré* in the quotation above (p. 153)? I suggest that it should be *puòsi tirare*, 'perhaps I shall shoot'.

W. D. TAYLOR

**Matthew Arnold. A Study.** By E. K. CHAMBERS. Pp. 144. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947. 8s. 6d. net.

In its scope and arrangement Sir Edmund Chambers's book fulfils at least one of the many felt needs in Arnold studies. It is the first attempt at a comprehensive account of Arnold's work since C. B. Tinker and H. F. Lowry's *Poetry of Matthew Arnold* (1940) made available a selection of valuable material from the Yale Collection; indeed, it is the first work of its kind (for Lionel Trilling's *Matthew Arnold*, 1939, was rather a study of Arnold's thought in relation to his age) since the *Letters of Arnold to Clough*, edited by H. F. Lowry in 1932. This fact and the guarantee of accuracy given by the author's name would alone make his book indispensable. It gives us Arnold's career in straightforward condensed narrative. The eight chapters deal with Arnold and his work in more or less chronological order (modified by subject-division, especially in the middle chapters, on the Poet, the Professor, and the Philosopher); and within the separate chapters the arrangement is strictly chronological. The needles, or most of them, are displayed in neat packets, not in haystacks.

In some respects, however, the convenience of the reader is not consulted. There are signs of 'austerity'. An elaborately classified index (nine main heads and numerous sub-heads) does not make up for the lack of a bibliography or of footnote references. The index has no category for works on Arnold; and even in the text they are seldom referred to. The withholding of information is sometimes tantalizing. For instance, we are told (p. 4) that 'Matthew's first recorded poem was *Lines Written on the Sea-Shore at Eaglehurst* . . . during July 1836', but not where this poem may be found. It has in fact been printed only in Iris Sells's *Matthew Arnold and France* (1935), Appendix A; it is not referred to by Lowry and Tinker or by Trilling.

On the other hand, Sir Edmund Chambers has added material not found in previous studies of Arnold, e.g. in the tables showing the Arnold pedigree



(and descendants); on pp. 14-16, a 'brief account of the early development of the Education Office'; and in his comments on some of the letters to Clough. One of these makes clear a characteristic jest in a letter of April 1852: 'Doubting Castle is, of course, University Hall.' It might be added that in that case Arnold's 'call' must have been in the previous December. The nickname is charmingly appropriate to the incongruity between the purpose of the building and its architecture. Another in October 1852 reveals Arnold's generosity in helping to finance Clough's passage to America ('that article' being the money, and not, as Lowry thought, the review of Arnold's poems).

It must be assumed (the book has no Preface) that it was not the author's intention to attempt a critical study of Arnold's work: brief critical comments do appear intermittently, but for the most part the author is an impartial recorder, giving us little even of the contemporary reaction to Arnold's writings, and no assessment of their relevance to our own age. His book should be judged primarily as literary biography—within the limits suggested by Arnold's expressed wish, limits which have perhaps become somewhat stretched in the last fifteen years.

From this point of view the chapter on 'Arnold's Youth' is the only one that seems inadequate in material. So little is known of this period (apart from the letters to Clough) that the whole of it would not have made the chapter unwieldy. On the early years there might be added Thomas Arnold's testimony that Arnold 'wrote much poetry' while at Rugby; of this nothing, presumably, survives except 'Alaric at Rome'. And the reader might have his attention drawn to the excellent article by Alan Harris, 'Matthew Arnold: the unknown years' (*Nineteenth Century*, 1933). More is to be found there on the family jokes against Matthew in the 'Fox How Magazine', and on his performance in the Schools; and it is, I believe, the only work on Arnold to refer to the engaging picture of Arnold as a master at Rugby (1844-5) in Arthur Gray Butler's novel *The Three Friends* (1900), based on recollections of Butler's own schooldays. (Mr. Harris did not mention the delightful seventh chapter, which exhibits Arnold eating strawberries, holding forth on the system of marks, and dreaming of a villa in the Caucasus to be shared with his 'beloved' Clough.) An equally vivid and better-authenticated record of Arnold as a schoolmaster is contained in Mrs. Margaret L. Woods's essay in *Essays and Studies*, vol. xv (pp. 7-9: the characteristic story of the three bull-pups, related by her father, Dean Bradley, who was Arnold's contemporary at Oxford and at Rugby). For the Oxford period there is the description by J. C. Shairp, a contemporary, in the poem 'Balliol Scholars 1840-1843' (written in 1872, first printed in *Glen Dessaray and other Poems*, 1888). Then there is that revealing description by Crabb Robinson, quoted by Bagehot and apparently dating from the breakfast parties of 1849. Crabb habitually forgot the names of his acquaintances and resorted to 'regular descriptions which recurred like Homeric epithets', an example being:

'Probably the most able, and certainly the most consequential, of all the young persons I know. You know which it is. The one with whom I could never presume to be intimate. The one whose father I knew so many years.'

The identity of this 'living poet', unnamed by Bagehot, is unmistakable.

The chapter on 'Arnold and Clough' is mainly a digest of the letters (itself no



easy task), but with 'additions . . . from other sources'. These might have included, besides 'Thyrsis' and the tribute in the last Homer lecture, a more considerable use of Clough's own letters to others, and his poems. The reading of these at any rate does not leave most readers with the impression conveyed by Sir Edmund's phrases 'an unhappy life', 'a morbid strain', and 'rather ineffective', which misrepresents Clough's buoyancy of temper. ('Thyrsis of his own will went away'; and Clough refers to his escape from Oxford as an 'emancipation' and his mood at the time as 'extremely jolly'.)

The fourth chapter, on 'The Poet', is considerably the longest. Here the author makes discriminating use of Tinker and Lowry's new material, and gives the history of Arnold's successive volumes more clearly and fully than any previous account (though we could have spared the number of lines in Arnold's longer poems). On one controversial issue the author announces a change of opinion since the date of his Warton lecture of 1931; he now accepts the division of 'Switzerland' and 'Faded Leaves' between 'Marguerite' and Fanny Lucy Wightman (Mrs. Matthew Arnold), in view of the evidence set out by Tinker and Lowry (which had been hinted at earlier by Harris). He is not quite happy about the title of 'Faded Leaves' ('the interval was rather short for them to fade in', p. 54). What has faded, surely, in the four or five years' interval between the writing and the group-titling of the poems, is the *trouble* expressed in them—faded in the light of the 'long honeymoon' that was Arnold's marriage. The title may show Arnold's characteristic blend of sentiment and fun (fun even perhaps to the extent of making the initials of 'Faded Leaves' correspond with those of 'Fanny Lucy'). It is the ribbon tied round a bundle of old love-letters—partly to separate them from the bundle labelled 'Switzerland'. There may still be room for different views on the ungrouped 'Marguerite' poems; the renunciation of love in 'The New Sirens' seems relevant, but is not mentioned; and there is perhaps more reason than Sir Edmund allows for associating 'The Forsaken Merman' and 'Tristram and Iseult' with 'Marguerite'. We know that it was at Thun that Arnold first read the story of Tristram; and the tale of Merlin and Vivien may reflect his own experience—if not, it is odd that he should invent the detail of the '*daisied circle*' of enchantment. On the other hand, Sir Edmund feels 'little doubt' that 'The Voice' is about Marguerite. But whether one takes 'long distant years' (1849) or 'a bygone year' (1877) as the original reading, the interval of at most a few months since the poet's meeting with 'Marguerite' is too short; and the only thing this voice has in common with her voice in the 'Parting' is that both affected Arnold. (One voice is 'melancholy' and 'lute-like', the other 'buoyant' and 'clear'.) If a parallel is to be found in Arnold's writings, is it not rather the passage on Newman in the lecture on Emerson (*Discourses in America*, 1885)? 'The most entrancing of voices . . . a religious music—subtle, sweet, mournful.' I prefer to take 'A Voice' as Arnold's tribute to the effect of Newman's sermons at Oxford; the poem expresses both the fascination and the resistance, and the year (1841 or 1842) is sufficiently 'distant', and might well seem, after Newman's secession, even more so.

Two smaller points: Sir Edmund Chambers has taken some trouble in establishing the probable dates of the two walks of 'Resignation' as 1838 and 1848,

making interesting use of Mrs. Eliza Fletcher's *Autobiography*; he speculates too on the 'leader' of the first walk, but without suggesting Dr. Arnold, whose leadership of a mountain party supplies some of the imagery of 'Rugby Chapel' (cf. Theodore Walrond in *D.N.B.*, and A. P. Stanley in *Life*, ch. iv). Then Sir Edmund is surprised at Arnold's own dissatisfaction with 'The Scholar Gipsy' in 1853, and says that he later thought better of it. But did he? The passages from letters quoted in support of this emphasize the Oxford sentiment, the '*couleur locale*', of the poem—in fact, the 'pleasing melancholy' which he had formerly found in it. He did not apparently change his mind about its failure to 'animate and ennoble'; but he may have meant to supply this deficiency in 'Thyrsis'.

In the last four chapters (some sixty pages) Sir Edmund deals with all the prose writings (except the 1853 Preface), as well as Arnold's career, his private life and character after 1857; this is a remarkable feat of selection and condensation, and it would be unfair to complain of particular omissions. Little is attempted in the way of interpretation or comment. Arnold is called, but not really shown to be, a 'philosopher'—a title he would have repudiated ('Philosophy has always been getting me into trouble'). And while it has been possible at least to suspect Sir Edmund of liking Arnold's poetry, it is impossible to guess what he thinks of the prose; all we are told is that he likes the passage about Oxford. The value of these chapters lies in their orderly assemblage of facts, and their quotations; not so much in their summaries of separate works (though these may be found only too useful in some quarters), for these summaries sacrifice nearly all Arnold's quality by conveying nothing of his critical *manner*. Arnold himself set a high value on his manner; that of the 'explorer rather than the doctor', 'my sinuous, easy, unpolemical way of proceeding'. ('I often wished', remarks Leslie Stephen, 'that I too had a little sweetness and light that I might be able to say such nasty things of my enemies.') It is just this 'vivacity', this high-spiritedness of Arnold's, which is lacking from Sir Edmund's useful study. Arnold has come out a little too solemn; what Tennyson called 'Matt's sublime waggery' is missing. We are left with the very impression Arnold wished to avoid—that of 'weight, but little or no charm'—and not with the Arnold of what is surely his most characteristic single work, *Friendship's Garland*.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

**Owen Meredith: A Critical Biography of Robert, first Earl of Lytton.**

By AURELIA BROOKS HARLAN. Pp. xii+292. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1946. \$3.75; 25s. net.

The title and sub-title of this book indicate what is in fact a troublesome disproportion. By the end the reader is convinced that 'Owen Meredith' does not deserve so full a study and is interesting only as one side of that complex personality, the first Earl of Lytton, to whose tenure of the Viceroyalty of India less than forty pages are devoted. Mrs. Aurelia Brooks Harlan brings out sympathetically the factors of inheritance and environment which helped to develop

him, but all her sympathy cannot prevent us from recognizing that 'Owen Meredith' mistook facility for poetry. She herself asks in her last sentence, 'What would have been the result had Lytton during the formative years of his youth been permitted, like Tennyson or Browning, for example, to be alternately the poet and idler in London and its environs?' But she has already given the answer: he would still have been himself, a derivative and not an original poet, with a fatal facility of rhyming, a lack of critical sense, and, what she does not note, an uncertain sense of rhythm. 'I don't like your form—the rhythmical—no, not at all', Mrs. Browning wrote candidly to him of *Lucile*, and one can only echo her comment and wonder at the hundred and more editions which the poem went through in America, where 'for two generations after its publication *Lucile* was one of the fixtures of the parlor table'. The fashion for long narrative poems and particularly for novels in verse does not give a full explanation. There are witty flashes and poetic flashes in *Lucile* as in the other poems—it is easy to see, for example, why William Morris enjoyed 'The Earl's Return', especially the passage quoted here on p. 78, and 'The Portrait' (pp. 110 and 111) has a Hardy-like irony—but they are swamped by the sheer volume of unpoetic thought and writing.

Mrs. Harlan deals conscientiously with everything 'Owen Meredith' wrote. There are some loose statements in her own writing which might be corrected: 'Goodnight in the Porch', for instance, is not an 'experimentation with the meter of "Locksley Hall"' (p. 80), since the lines are iambic, not trochaic; the Prologue to 'The Wanderer' is not 'written in a stanza form combining the alternating rhyme and *In Memoriam* quatrains' (p. 92), since the lines are of five and not of four feet; and it is a little hard to make all 'Tennysonian women' like Cousin Amy (p. 108). George IV is given too great responsibility in the reference to 'the riotous habits which [he] had taught his favored people' (p. 2); in the statement (p. 47) that Isa Blagden was in many ways 'the embodiment of Victorian womanhood, even though she wrote to supplement her income,' *especially since* would be historically more accurate than *even though*; and the remark about 'The Death of King Hacon' (p. 113) that 'as befits the Scandinavian subject and manner, the poem is written in simpler, more unadorned verse than that in which Lytton usually wrote' does not show firsthand acquaintance with the kind of verse that tenth-century Norwegian court-poets usually composed. The reference, may, however, be to the actual *Hákonarmál* and not intended as a general criticism.

EDITH C. BATHO

### SHORT NOTICES

**Boswell.** By CLAUDE COLLEER ABBOTT (Robert Spence Watson Lecture, 1945-6). Pp. 24. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Literary and Philosophical Society, 1946. 1s. 6d. net.

Prof. Abbott begins with a sketch of the history of Boswell's 'Private Papers': their long sleep and supposed death, their discovery at Malahide and especially (the story he has already told so well) by himself at Fettercairn. This is admirably done, though we may

demur to the description of Colonel Isham as 'a wealthy American'—he is more than that—and of his acquisition as 'booty'. It is too often forgotten that Col. Isham's generation derives from Boswell's almost as much as our own in this island, and is entitled to its share.

The legend that the papers were destroyed at Boswell's death dates from the publication by Rogers, in 1874, of *Boswelliana*. But it was probably already accepted. Justice has not been done, I venture to think, to a suggestion of my own, many years ago, that the myth was invented by Robert Boswell. He had advised destruction, and it would be like what we know of him to assume, and to proclaim, that his advice had been taken.

Prof. Abbott's character of Boswell is admirably drawn. He recognizes his limitations, moral and intellectual; but he does full justice to his genius: his extraordinary powers of memory, of concentration; his amazing energy and even (in some vital matters) self-discipline; his abounding human sympathy; the virtues, often ignored, of his style, perfectly fitted to its subject. It is too much to say that 'the Johnson most of us know is as much Boswell's creation as Falstaff is Shakespeare's'; but that is perhaps the only misstatement in a well-balanced survey.

The Fettercairn journals will in due time, no doubt, be edited with the Malahide journals by Prof. Pottle and his team for both the learned and the general. But there is much besides. The Yale Walpole has taught us that the usual modern method of editing a man's letters in one chronological series is not the best, if a correspondence is bulky and from many hands. It occurs that the Boswell-Temple correspondence, now that we have both sides, would gain greatly by separate presentation. There are also Boswell's letters to Forbes, which were found at Fettercairn and remain, of course, the property of Lord Clinton.

R. W. CHAPMAN

**Dryden. Poèmes choisis.** Traduction, préface et notes par PIERRE LEGOUIS.  
Pp. 442. Paris: Aubier, 1946. No price quoted.

Prof. Pierre Legouis has contributed a new volume to the *Collection Bilingue* published by Aubier. This collection has developed all the more rapidly as the English-reading public in France, particularly University students, is sorely in need of English texts, of which there was no supply from England during the war, and which since the war are hardly more procurable. Prof. Legouis's aim has been to supply as complete a choice of Dryden's works as was compatible with a 442 page volume, including introduction, text, translation, and notes, these being reduced to a minimum. The choice comprises the *Heroick Stanzas*, *Annus Mirabilis*, *MacFlecknoe*, *Absalom and Achitophel*, *Religio Laici*, &c. . . . The introduction makes full use of previous editors and critics, to whose work Prof. Legouis has added learned and judicious remarks, together with fruitful and original comparisons between Dryden and his French contemporaries, such as could be expected from one who has studied the age of Dryden more than any other French scholar.

Prof. Legouis has chosen to translate in prose, and not in verse; he has thereby followed neither Dryden's example, nor his father's, Émile Legouis. But his aim was fidelity and clarity. In fact his translation serves as a most useful comment, and may be used by the English reader with profit. We may well believe him when he says he has consulted the *O.E.D.* 'thousands of times', and he has caught the great authority napping more than once, especially in the omission of earlier or later examples of some words or meanings. The general impression is inevitably one of sincerity more than elegance. Sometimes one may wonder whether Prof. Legouis has not allowed himself to be too scrupulously bound to the original. When Dryden speaks of a hare as *she* (*Annus Mirabilis*, st. 131), he simply uses the current feminine form, as in the case of ship or cat, whereas the translation by the French feminine, *une hase*, unduly stresses the sex. And is it possible to render 'spicy Forests' by 'des forêts épicées'?

But these are minor details which do not take away from the value of this very thorough and scholarly piece of work.

E. AUDRA

## SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By KATHLEEN TILLOTSON

### BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

*Vol. 31, No. 1, January 1948*

Shakespeare's *Othello* (H. B. Charlton), pp. 28-53.

[Critical study in relation to source.]

### DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

*Vol. 40, No. 2, March 1948*

What is Shakespeare's Henry VIII about? (Frank Kermode), pp. 48-55.

E.L.H.

*Vol. 14, No. 4, December 1947*

John Donne in meditation: The 'Anniversaries' (Louis L. Martz), pp. 247-73.

[Analysis of structure and themes.]

Ben Jonson and Father Thomas Wright (Theodore A. Stroud), pp. 274-82.

[Suggested identity with the priest of Jonson's conversion.]

The pleasures of tragedy (Earl R. Wassermann), pp. 283-307.

[With special reference to eighteenth-century criticism.]

On Dr. Johnson's fear of death (J. H. Hagstrum), pp. 308-19.

Critics at cross-purposes (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 320-8.

[On 'the object as in itself it really is'.]

### ENGLISH STUDIES

*Vol. 28, No. 6, December 1947*

Thoor, Ballylee (A. Norman Jeffares), pp. 161-8.

[Yeats's castle and *The Tower*.]

*ipplen* in *Sawles Warde* (S. R. T. O. d'Ardenne and J. R. R. Tolkien), pp. 168-70.

Sir Thomas Browne's supposed visit to the continent (Jac. G. Riewald), pp. 171-3.

'Dover Beach' and *The Bothie of Tober-na-Vuolich* (Paul Turner), pp. 173-8.

Current Literature ii. Criticism and Biography (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 185-92.

[Survey for 1947.]

*Vol. 29, No. 1, February 1948*

Woman and the fall of man (Paul Turner), pp. 1-18.

[Argues against the interpretation in A. J. A. Waldock's *Paradise Lost and its critics*.]

The etymology of *point-blank* (A. A. Prins), pp. 18-21.

*Vol. 29, No. 2, April 1948*

The change of emphasis in the criticism of Henry James (Heidi Specker), pp. 33-47.

English studies in Czechoslovakia after the war (Vilém Fried), pp. 47-8.

## HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

## Vol. II, No. 2, November 1947

'Silver-tongued Smith', paragon of Elizabethan preachers (John L. Lievsay), pp. 13-36.

Joseph Haslewood and the Roxburghe Club (Cathleen Hayhurst Wheat), pp. 37-49.

## Vol. II, No. 3, February 1948

Sir Thomas Egerton as patron (Virgil B. Heltzel), pp. 105-28.

Ralegh on the problems of chronology (Ernest A. Strathmann), pp. 129-48.

The literary reputation of John Ford (Wallace A. Bacon), pp. 181-99.

[Critical study of three chief plays.]

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

## Vol. 62, No. 4, April 1947

Some neglected sources of 'Admiratio' (Marvin T. Herrick), pp. 222-6.

The fifth commandment: some allusions to Sir Robert Filmer's writings in *Tristram Shandy* (Wilfred Watson), pp. 234-40.

Browning and Swinburne: an episode (Kenneth L. Knickerbocker), pp. 240-4.

[Unpublished letter from Browning to Milnes in 1863 (?) with commentary.]

George Moore and Édouard Dujardin (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 244-51.

Irving and Moore: a note on Anglo-American literary relations (Thomas A. Kirby), pp. 251-5.

Beowulf and Grendel: an analogue from Burma (Henry Bosley Woolf), pp. 261-2.

Another note on Dryden's use of Georges de Scudéry's *Almahide* (Jerome W. Schweitzer), pp. 262-3.

Henry Needler's knowledge of Shaftesbury (Alfred Owen Aldridge), pp. 264-7.

Authenticity of 'The Wish' as a Rochester poem (James Thorpe), pp. 267-8.

An attempted piracy of *The Duenna* (Howard P. Vincent), pp. 268-70.

## Vol. 63, No. 1, January 1948

Anglian and Saxon elements in Wulfstan's vocabulary (R. J. Menner), pp. 1-9.

Keats' elysium of poets (G. Giovanni), pp. 19-25.

[In 'Bards of Passion' and sonnet on Chapman's Homer.]

New manuscripts of *The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers* (Curt F. Bühler), pp. 26-30.

Two notes on the chess terms in *The Book of the Duchess* (Franklin D. Cooley), pp. 30-5.

Daisies pied and icicles (Bertrand H. Bronson), pp. 35-8.

Sir Henry Goodere and Donne's letters (Stanley Johnson), pp. 38-43.

Sam. Johnson's word-hoard (George S. McCue), pp. 43-5.

[Omissions in *Dictionary*.]

A note on James Thomson's sources (Horace E. Hamilton), pp. 46-8.

Twain as forerunner of tooth-and-claw criticism (George W. Feinstein), pp. 49-50.



Uguiccone on the name of Y (H. D. Austin), pp. 50-1.

The merit of Malkyn (Frederic G. Cassidy), pp. 52-3.

[*Piers Plowman*, i. 182 (B-text).]

A note on Chaucer's *Tale of Melibee* (James R. Kreuzer), pp. 53-4.

Two Chaucer allusions: 1819 and 1899 (Robert A. Pratt), pp. 55-6.

'The Triple Tun' again (Thomas A. Kirby), pp. 56-7.

[Addendum to previous note, M.L.N., vol. 62, pp. 191-2.]

A pilgrimage to the Holy Land (A. R. Dunlap), pp. 57-8.

[Unrecorded ME. poem in *Purchas his Pilgrims*, 1625.]

*Basket* (Leo Spitzer), pp. 58-9.

[Etymology.]

Ticius to Tuskan, G G K, line 11 (Coolidge Otis Chapman), pp. 59-60.

*Vol. 63, No. 2, February 1948*

Poetry preserved in music. Bibliographical notes on Smollett and Oswald, Handel and Haydn (Otto Erich Deutsch), pp. 73-88.

On the persons in Dryden's *Essay of Dramatic Poesy* (Frank Livingstone Huntley), pp. 88-95.

The verge of the court and arrest for debt in Fielding's *Amelia* (John C. Stephens, Jr.), pp. 104-9.

A letter from Samuel Richardson to Alexis Claude Clairhaut (Alan D. McKillop), pp. 109-13.

Charles Churchill and 'Statira' (Arthur Waldhorn), pp. 114-18.

Note on a *Beowulf* passage (Henry Winfred Splitter), pp. 118-21.

[ll. 745-9.]

OE. *ealle präge* (F. P. Magoun, Jr.), pp. 127-8.

A note on Coleridge's 'Gutch commonplace book' (James Thorpe), pp. 130-1.

[Source of a paragraph on Milton.]

Hawthorne and Griswold (Philip Marsh), pp. 132-3.

Thomas J. Wise and the Wrenn catalogue (John W. Draper), pp. 135-8.

[Text of letter from Wise; notes by Miss Fannie Ratchford.]

NOTES AND QUERIES

*Vol. 193, No. 2, 24 January 1948*

'The Eve of St. Agnes' and Spenser (R. F. Rashbrook), pp. 29-31.

The Private Memoirs and Confessions of a justified sinner (F. H. Amphlett Micklewright), pp. 37-8.

Carlyle and 'Pickwick' (T.C.D.), p. 40.

*Vol. 193, No. 3, 7 February 1948*

Sir John Mandeville—VIII (Malcolm Letts), pp. 52-3.

[Continued from N. & Q., vol. 192, pp. 494-5.]

Wyatt's poems in Add. MS. 17492 (Kenneth Muir), pp. 53-4.

[Corrections of Miss Foxwell's edition; continued, 20 March, pp. 124-5.]

Portents in *Hamlet* (Kenneth Muir), pp. 54-5.

The genesis of Jonson's *Epicoene* (A.D.), pp. 55-6.

Unrecorded printings of Thomas Sheridan's inventory of Dean Swift's goods at Laracor (*Unsigned*), pp. 56-7.

*Vol. 193, No. 4, 21 February 1948*

Defoe's 'Some Reply to Mr. Hodges and some other authors' (Charles Eaton Burch), pp. 72-4.

*Vol. 193, No. 5, 6 March 1948*

The authorship of 'A letter concerning trade from several Scots gentlemen that are authors in London', &c. (1706) (Charles Eaton Burch), pp. 101-3.  
[Defoe?]

*Vol. 193, No. 6, 20 March 1948*

The brothers and sisters of John Dryden, the poet (P. D. Mundy), pp. 120-4.

*Vol. 193, No. 7, 3 April 1948*

Links with Shakespeare—II. (H. A. Shield), pp. 140-1.

[Continued from vol. 191, p. 112.]

Smollett's creditor Maclean identified (Francesco Cordasco), pp. 141-2.

George Eliot and the classics (V.R.), pp. 148-9.

[Continued from vol. 192, pp. 564-5.]

'Mullipood' (J. George), pp. 149-50.

[In Middleton's *A Trick to catch the Old One*, IV. v.]

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

*Vol. 26, No. 3, July 1947*

Literature and music as sister arts: an aspect of aesthetic theory in eighteenth-century Britain (Herbert M. Schueller), pp. 193-205.

Benjamin Robert Haydon (Varley Lang), pp. 235-47.

[Anticipations of Arnold, Ruskin, Morris.]

Horace's influence on Robert Herrick (Graydon W. Regenos), pp. 268-84.

The mock marriage device in *Pamela* (Alan D. McKillop), pp. 285-8.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

*Vol. 65, No. 1, January 1948*

Old English vowel lengthening and vowel shortening before consonant groups (Norman E. Eliason), pp. 1-20.

The sources of Laurence Nowell's *Vocabularium Saxonicum* (Albert H. Marckwardt), pp. 21-36.

The structural integrity of *Piers Plowman B* (Gordon Hall Gerould), pp. 60-75.

A note on E. K. (Raymond Jenkins), pp. 76-9.

Swift's 'little language' in the *Journal to Stella* (Irvin Ehrenpreis), pp. 80-8.

Garrick's production of *King Lear*: a study in the temper of the eighteenth-century mind (George Winchester Stone, Jr.), pp. 89-103.

les

en

-3.

-4.

2.

nth-

4.

nant

H.

60-

o-8.

nth-